The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 1898.

The Week.

One reason why the country is receiving the assurance of speedy peace so quietly is that it has been certain to come ever since Spain asked our terms. It has, therefore, been "discounted" by the general public as well as by the stock market. There will probably be no very enthusiastic demonstrations when the suspension of hostilities is declared, unless by our soldiers and sailors. Their predominantly humane instincts and motives have been shown more than once in the course of the war, and they will hail the order bidding them save life instead of taking it. Nor have we the sense of deliverance from an overshadowing national peril to make us celebrate the date of the signing of the treaty of peace (as an impetuous Western editor advises) as a national holiday. We have conquered a weak antagonist, and have done it quickly, and to be too exuberant over the performance would look as if we had been none too sure of ourselves. The public, moreover, are alive to the fact that the problems thrust upon us by the peace are going to be much more serious than those we have had to face in the war itself. None the less, peace so soon arrived at, and after so comparatively small a loss of life, is a great cause for rejoicing.

Doubt is raised in some quarters whether an armistice will be declared pending the negotiation of a definitive treaty of peace. There ought to be, there can be, no doubt about this. The main object in seeking peace was to prevent further needless bloodshed. The war was degenerating into little more than butchery. Spain's power of resistance was fatally broken, though her men could still stand up to be slaughtered if necessary. But for fighting of even the most desultory character to go on with peace in sight would be too frightful. It would be like maintaining a public shambles for human victims. We cannot believe that the proclamation of an armisticee will be delayed a single day after Spain's acceptance is made known to our Government. If Sagasta has not asked it, the President should announce it on his own motion and without an instant's hesitation.

The report of a fight at Manila on the night of July 31 comes at a critical time, considering the fact that peace negotiations are almost concluded. There is no room for a charge of bad faith against Spain in any case, seeing that we continued hostilities in Porto Rico while the negotiations were proceeding. It should be borne in mind also that Spain has no means of communication with her forces in Manila except by smuggling through our lines or those of Aguinaldo. The first vague talk about peace got into the newspapers of July 22, and it would have taken nine or ten days for the news to reach Manila even without obstructions. In fact, it took nine days for the news of the battle to reach us, although there was no obstruction. All that can be said about the fight is that it was inopportune, but much more so for the Spaniards than for us, as their losses were far greater than ours.

The probability of an extra session of the Senate appears to be remote. The President has full power to appoint a commission to negotiate a treaty of peace with Spain, and there will be nothing for the Senate to do until that treaty has been concluded. It seems to be conceded that the commission will sit in Paris, and a considerable period of time must be allowed for its assembling and its deliberations. There is very slight chance that its work can be completed much before the regular assembling of Congress in December. The President, in fact, has the matter virtually in his own hands, and it is cause for congratulation that he has. No matter how "Jingoish" or "imperialistic" the Senate may feel when it assembles in December, no matter how Foraker may rant and Chandler rave, it is inconceivable that any treaty which may go before it for approval, after nearly or quite four months of virtual peace, will be rejected. The country will be so overwhelmingly on the side of the President and his solution of the question that the Senate will not dare to do anything except acquiesce. To refuse would be to reopen the war, and even the Senate would not venture upon that course.

Now that the foreign war is practically over, the strife becomes internecine; the generals and eke the colonels in the field fall to wrangling with the Secretary of War, who proceeds to give them as good as they send. The whole affair is humiliating and disgraceful. We can only thank Heaven that the Santiago campaign was fortunately over as it was before these revelations came to light. With a spirit looking painfully like insubordination in the officers of the army, and with the Secretary of War acting like a man moved by personal and political spite, the outlook would be alarming enough if there were still serious fighting before us. As it is, the work of saving the army from destruction by disease is the duty of the hour, and we are glad to believe that efficient measures have been taken to that end.

The unseemly controversy which is filling many columns of the press as to who is responsible for the lack of medical and other supplies for the army in Cuba has gained such headway that putting a limit to it now is probably out of the question. Everybody who chooses to take a hand in it, from Gen. Shafter and the Surgeon-General of the army down to all the privates and assistant surgeons and nurses, apparently feels free to do so. The Secretary of War has set the example in this method of discussing all questions connected with the campaign, and it is not to be wondered at that, with the newspapers egging them on, everybody below him connected with the war should be eager to take a hand in it. If this extraordinary unveiling of the War Department and army methods shall lead to a thoroughgoing official inquiry into the whole conduct of the campaign, it will not be a cause for regret.

The one great military lesson of the war is the need of reorganizing the staff of the army. Our cumbrous and obsolete system was certain to show such lamentable failures to coöperate between the different departments, and such woful lack of intelligent and centralized direction, as we have had pressed upon our attention so painfully in the last few days. It was not only that the war caught us unprepared. Our system was radically wrong, and could not be made to work well with all the time in the world to get it going. This is shown to demonstration in the authorized defence of the Surgeon-General made in the Philadelphia *Medical Journal* on Saturday. The medical department was, of course, hampered by an inadequate force, but the thing that made its best efforts fail was lack of coördination with the Quartermaster-General and the other heads of the army. Now it is this working at cross-purposes which the general staff of the Germany army, and of all other civilized armies save our own, prevents. Our military experts, especially our highly educated younger officers, have urged the adoption of the general staff in our army again and again, but thus far in vain. It is to be hoped that the needless suffering due to needless official blundering in the Santiago campaign may at last startle a complacent Congress into putting our army, in this essential matter of organization, on a par with the best armies in Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The prime cause of the troubles is "politics." Does anybody doubt that if the control of supplies for the Santiago expedition had been entirely in the hands of the Navy Department, all these scandals and failures, involving not only great suffering, but loss of life, would have been avoided? What knowledge had the great force of civilians who were suddenly injected into the Quartermaster and Commissary Departments of the army of the business of which they were to take charge? In no field of human activity is expert knowledge of more vital importance than in these branches of the military service in time of war. Yet the authorities at Washington fairly stuffed them with men who had no other qualification for the work than that they were the sons, or relations, or protégés of men with a "pull." This of itself would have been bad enough, but these departments were already antiquated in their organization, mere relics of a military system which ceased to be of value thirty-five years ago. Any system of administration would break down under such conditions. To make the medical branch of the service dependent upon the Quartermaster and Commissary Departments of the army, largely filled as these were with incompetent men, was, as an eminent medical authority has said, a "sanitary crime equalled only by the selection of notoriously unhealthy places for the location of the preparation camps." It was surely nothing less than a crime to subject men who had offered their lives to the service of their country to such entirely needless perils. Public opinion is placing the primal responsibility for all this upon the Secretary of War, and if he hopes to escape it he must invite a full and fearless examination of all his doings since the war began.

According to the statements attributed to the naval officers who have been inspecting the fortifications of Santiago, the guns of our vessels did very little injury. Over $2,000,000 worth of ammunition was expended, and the chief harm done seems to have been that occasioned to our own ships by the tremendous shaking which it gives them to fire off their big guns. If it be true that ships' guns cannot reduce earthworks except when aided by land forces, we ought to be satisfied to adhere to a policy of peace. We see that the danger from hostile fleets is not so great as our imperialists would have us believe; and since no one dreads an invasion by land, we are secure enough without a gigantic navy. Moreover, it seems to be established that if the forts at Santiago had been demolished, the harbor could not have been entered by our navy without losing some vessels. The mines were well placed, and contained very powerful charges, the mine-house was equipped with the best electrical apparatus, and everything indicated that practically complete protection was secured. When we consider that the forts were furnished with obsolete artillery, some of the bronze cannon being cast in 1737, and think what would have happened if modern artillery had been mounted instead of those mediæval affairs, and had been served by as good gunners as ours, the danger to which our ports are exposed from hostile navies appears insignificant. It seems all the more foolish to annex territories which cannot be defended by fortifications, but require a naval armament costing more than they are worth to maintain our communication with them.

With the passing of the war there will come the question of how much military glory has been accumulated which will be available for political uses in the near future. In this respect the war has been far less fruitful than many supposed it would be. The supply of glory with political possibilities in it is very small. Gen. Wheeler has secured some of it, but he is too old to make much use of it. Col. Roosevelt has a good deal of it, and Mr. Platt and other politicians are endeavoring to decide at this moment just how much it is worth. But, aside from these instances, nobody else who has stirred the popular heart figures in the minds of the people to-day as an aspirant for high political honors. Neither Dewey, nor Hobson, nor Shafter, nor Sampson, nor Schley is "spoken of" as a Presidential possibility, and, in all probability, none of them desires to be. Other men who would like to be at this moment looming in the popular mind in that capacity have had no chance to secure the requisite glory. There is Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, who returned from Havana big with Presidential possibilities. The war is likely to end with him still in camp waiting for the movement upon Havana, which is never to start. There is William J. Bryan, who was made a Colonel with no other result than to fail to get into the field till the war was over. Many others might be mentioned who have met a like fate. They have offered to serve their country, and have done it so far as opportunity was given them, and they will have to find consolation and reward in the consciousness of duty done.

The question of territorial expansion is dividing parties. The platform of the Indiana Republicans avoids it. It expresses approval of the annexation of Hawaii, but it stops with that. It favors the establishment of coaling stations wherever necessary—a policy which can be condemned only by people who insist on unnecessary stations—but it does not say where these stations should be. It calls for the extension of American trade, the creation of a navy to correspond, and the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, our Government to have exclusive control; but it says nothing about enlarging our territory. On the other hand, the platform recommends "the enactment and enforcement of laws restricting and preventing the immigration of such undesirable foreign population as is prejudicial to free American labor." The truth is, that, in order to maintain the system of protection, the Republican politicians have of recent years been magnifying the danger of the competition of cheap Asiatic labor. They have explained to the working classes that the inhabitants of Asia live on next to nothing and are paid wages that amount to but a few cents a day, and it is quite probable that American laborers have been frightened by this bogy. To propose to annex ten or a dozen millions of these degraded Asiatics to the United States is therefore a policy which will have to be rather diplomatically advanced in States where the labor vote is an important factor, as it is in Indiana. To explain why the competition of the people of the Philippine Islands should be pernicious while they were ruled by Spain, and innocuous if they were annexed to our country, will be a task from which the ordinary politician may well shrink. The difficulty of this task explains the refusal of the Republican leaders to define what they mean by a policy of expansion, but they will not be able to avoid the difficulty much longer.

On the other hand, the Democrats of Texas are falling out over the same problem. The policy to be favored by the Democratic party would naturally be one of opposition to the measures of the Administration. It was an absurd blunder to force the Administration into a war which could end only in victory for our arms and popular support for the party directing operations. In consequence of this blunder, the Democrats now find themselves impelled to support the policy of the Administration in grasping the spoils of war. Instead of being able to oppose this policy, they are practically committed to its support. Some of the leaders recognize the suicidal character of this course, and try to show that it is the business of a party in opposition to oppose; but as most Democrats having any reputation for statesmanship have been driven out of the party, the task is almost hopeless. In such a State as Texas the traditional Democratic policy of extending the limits of the United States is naturally acceptable. It was through this policy that Texas came into the Union, and the spirit that brought it in is not extinct. There is no labor vote to pander to in Texas, and it is vain to attempt to commit the Democratic party there to opposition to the application of principles in which it has always boasted. It was bad

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politics for the Democrats to goad the Administration into a war, and the present embarrassment of their leaders is nothing more than they deserve.

The "financial plank" of the platform of the Indiana Republicans is not quite so clear as that adopted in Iowa, but it is much better than that of Illinois. It has often been worse in Indiana, and indicates progress. It is explicit enough on the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, regarding this "as absolutely certain to debase our money and destroy our private and public credit and cause general business disaster." But it is rather indefinite on the question of currency reform. It recognizes the necessity for "comprehensive and enlightened monetary legislation," and favors giving the declaration of the St. Louis platform about the gold standard "the vitality of law," but pronounces for no specific measures. Perhaps we ought to regard it as a satisfactory step in advance to have political conventions recognize the necessity of monetary legislation at all. If the Republicans are committed on this point, the conditions are favorable for getting a measure that will relieve the country from an ever-recurring peril.

There seems to be no doubt that Mr. Croker is about to assume complete control of the Democratic party of this State, having become fully possessed with a sense of his own capacity to be a "great national leader." It is said that he is about to start an evening newspaper in this city devoted to his personal interests and views. Few people outside politics know that he has for some time maintained such a morning newspaper, but this is a fact. The expense must be considerable, but the boss is in a position to sustain it without difficulty. He has already opened "war" upon ex-Senator Hill, who has demonstrated his unfitness for the position of even deputy party leader by speaking of Mr. Croker as a "race-track statesman." That will put Mr. Hill outside the pale of boss favor as completely as Bourke Cockran's observations about Mr. Croker's sudden wealth put him there several years ago.

The prevention of smallpox by vaccination is recognized as necessary so generally in this country that the prejudice against it in England is incomprehensible. Nevertheless it exists to such an extent that the Government has been obliged to yield to it and to abandon the principle of compulsory vaccination. The measure agreed upon will provide that no parent will be convicted for refusing to vaccinate a child if he satisfies the court that he has a conscientious disbelief in vaccination. Nor is any parent to be proceeded against more than twice in respect of the same child. This is a practical surrender of the principle of compulsion, but it seems to have been unavoidable. The number of children born annually in England is about 922,000, and the returns for 1893 showed that of that number 150,000 remained unvaccinated, while in 1897 the number had increased to 250,000, and is now probably 300,000—this in spite of several outbreaks of smallpox in places where vaccination is unpopular, in which the unvaccinated suffered severely. It is contended in support of the new law that it will at least reach careless parents who have no scruples of conscience to plead. But it is not probable that such parents will be unable to produce the necessary scruples when they are arrested for disregarding the law. In fact, this result is already indicated by the experience of certain local authorities. In a place near Bristol a circular was sent out informing parents that conscientious scruples would be respected, and such scruples were immediately multiplied. Parents who had previously had all their children vaccinated without objection, declined after the circular was issued to continue their consent. It seems to be generally admitted that the opposition is too stubborn to be overcome by penal laws, and apparently there is nothing to do but to let the punishment ordained by nature take its course.

The Congress of the English Trade-Unions has for some years been under the control of the Socialists, and they have now completed the symmetry of their schemes. They have heretofore demanded that the hours of labor should be limited to eight per day in all trades and occupations, and that a minimum rate of wages should be established, and now they call for "a measure embodying the principle of protection, by which alone declining British industries can be effectually restored." This is a perfectly logical demand from the socialistic point of view. If Parliament can raise the rate of wages, why should it not exclude foreign competition? While it is deplorable that these great trade-unions, whose work as societies for mutual aid has been so excellent, should fall into the hands of their present counsellors, it is not to be regretted that the identity of the principle of protection with the theory of socialism should be exposed. For the sake of a most impressive lesson to mankind we could almost wish that the English people might try the experiment of protection for a little while; but the trade-unions will have to be stronger than they are now to bring it about.

The international conference held at Brussels on the question of sugar bounties has had the same fate as the international conferences on bimetallism; which, indeed, have been conferences on the question of silver bounties. The attitude of England has been characteristic. Lord Salisbury and the Tory element in general are but half-hearted free-traders, not a few of them, indeed, being avowed protectionists, and they have in a roundabout way gone to work to pay bounties to the sugar-planters of the West Indies. At the same time, they have not ventured to favor any action which should arouse the opposition of the consumers of sugar in Great Britain, who are not merely people of that country, but certain large manufacturers of jam and jelly and other conserves, who possess great political influence. To put a duty on imports of sugar with a view to neutralize the export bounties of other countries would be a palpable attempt to tax important manufactures of England, as well as all its inhabitants, for the benefit of a few concerns in Jamaica and Barbados, and would be extremely unpopular. Hence the subterfuge of subsidizing these concerns by a grant from the imperial revenues has been resorted to, the effect being, as we have said, the same as a bounty on production. Under these circumstances the British delegates were very judiciously instructed by Lord Salisbury to be very particular to put forward no definite proposals, and to maintain an "attitude of reserve" upon all important points.

The report of the delegates, however, indicates that such caution was superfluous. The conference was called for the purpose of suppressing bounties on exports of sugar, or, at least, for an examination of this question. The delegates from Austria-Hungary, Germany, and the Netherlands announced that their Governments were in favor of a complete suppression of these bounties. But the delegate from France stated that his Government, although willing to withdraw the direct bounty on export granted by it in 1897, yet entered the conference with the express reservation that its system of indirect bounties on export should remain outside the scope of the discussions. The Russian delegate informed the conference that his Government had accepted the invitation to attend only on the express understanding that the internal law of Russia concerning sugar bounties should not be considered, adding the categorical statement that his Government had no intention of altering its existing legislation on the subject. The French delegate politely intimated that his instructions did not permit him to entertain any propositions for altering the French system. The unyielding attitude of these two Powers, the English delegates report, "presented an insurmountable obstacle to any agreement," and it became evident that "a prolongation of the conference at the present moment could not lead to any general understanding."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNING INFERIOR RACES.

The idea of educating barbarous tribes up to the level of American citizenship, and thus to the capacity for self-government, has a fascination for many of our people. They do not pretend to know how it is to be done, but they have great faith that it can be done somehow. No doubt this idea is supported by generous feeling; those who entertain it, many of them at least, do so from benevolent motives. But they seem, in insisting on our responsibilities, to ignore almost invariably the frightful consequences of failure. It is certainly as wrong to assume responsibilities for which we have made no suitable preparation as it is to decline them. No conscientious person would take the destiny of another human being in charge without in the first place carefully examining his own qualifications for so serious an undertaking. A man who applies to an asylum for destitute children, professing a wish to adopt some young girl whose natural guardians have abused her, is required to furnish evidence of the purity of his motives. If it is found that he has previously adopted orphans and maltreated them shockingly, and that he has never maintained such decent regulations in his household as would indicate the sincerity of his benevolence, his professions of better conduct in the future are properly regarded with suspicion. He may have repented, but he must bring forth works meet for repentance before he undertakes to elevate other people.

The case is not different with nations. An individual can be held to some responsibility, but a government cannot. If one people subdues another, the other can take no appeal. It may writhe, but there is no authority that can intervene for its protection if it is maltreated. Hence, when it is deliberately proposed as a measure of national policy to subdue various uncivilized peoples from motives of benevolence, we must insist on evidence that our Government has shown some competency for such work. But such evidence is not forthcoming. No one pretends that our Government has dealt well with the Indians. No one that did pretend this would be believed. There is a book, entitled 'A Century of Dishonor,' which contains the history of our treatment of the Indian tribes, and no one has ever tried to refute its statements. In fact, the majority of our people are entirely ignorant of the character of our dealings with the Indians and are supremely indifferent to the matter. Probably nine-tenths of the well-meaning persons who are now indulging in the vague talk of imparting the blessings of our civilization to the Malay races, have never taken the slightest interest in our Indian tribes or felt the least responsibility for their elevation. It ill becomes such persons to declare that we have responsibilities in Asia that we must not shirk. We had responsibilities here which we did shirk, and worse than shirk, and it is a shameless proceeding to ignore our past in imagining our future. We began the present war by announcing the unselfishness of our motives. Just as soon as the Spanish fleet was destroyed at Manila a large number of our humanitarians dropped their horror at what President McKinley called "criminal aggression," and proclaimed that we were going to get all the Spanish territory we could and to keep all we got. Is this not a warning of what will happen to the missionary spirit when political ambition and commercial greed begin their work in remote colonies?

Some of our English advisers are no doubt to some extent disinterested in wishing us to engage in the work of civilizing the Malay tribes, but they are careful to point out the conditions of success. The *London and China Telegraph* says that we should govern the Philippines as Great Britain governs the native states of the Malay Peninsula. The principle of government there has been the consideration of the interests of the subjects felt by the British officials. The residents were accredited to the native states for the purpose of collecting and administering their revenues and of giving the native authorities good advice. "Not by wars involving the slaughter of native races, not by drafts upon the imperial exchequer, not by agency of chartered companies, which necessarily seek first their own interests, has the development of the Malay states been attained." By the selection of admirably qualified men, "an administration of sympathy, consideration, and mutual respect" has been developed. Did our Congress develop such an administration of the "native states" with which we had to deal? If it did not, what change has taken place in the hearts of Congressmen that will make their administration of the Philippine Islands better? We have no body of trained public servants from whom administrators could be chosen, and there is nothing to suggest that they would not be selected just as our Indian agents have been chosen. What our Senators think of reforming our civil service is shown by the census bill which they have just passed; and to suppose that such men as the Senators from New York and Pennsylvania, for instance, will contemplate our colonies, not as politicians, but as high-minded Christian statesmen, is to fly in the face of common sense. It is not our religious editors or our clergymen that will direct our colonial administration. Our politicians will have control of it. Those who demand that our Government shall take charge of millions of helpless beings on the other side of the globe, on the assumption that the politicians are to be excluded, are assuming a more terrible responsibility than they are willing to admit. Let them ask themselves seriously if there is any evidence that our government of these people will be what they admit it ought to be. If there is such evidence, let it be produced. If there is not, let us cast the beam out of our own eye before attempting to remove the mote from that of our brother.

THE RELIGIOUS PROBLEM IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The appeal, or demand, of the Vatican that the lives of Catholics in and about Manila be protected by the United States forces, may have been a disagreeable surprise to President McKinley, but it should not have been. Some have professed to see in it a recognition by the Catholic Church of our sovereignty over the Philippines. That does not follow. It is, however, a recognition of the serious and solemn obligations we have taken upon ourselves by our conduct in Manila Bay. The moment the President ordered Admiral Dewey to stay there after executing his original instructions to destroy the Spanish fleet; the moment he gave orders to coöperate with the insurgents, by furnishing them arms and ammunition, in order to weaken and ultimately to overthrow the Spanish military power in the islands, that moment, consciously or unconsciously, Mr. McKinley assumed for this country the duty of at least preserving the lives and property of non-combatants in and about Manila. The Vatican is perfectly right in notifying our Government that we shall be held responsible, morally at any rate, if there are massacres of nuns and friars on the shores of Manila Bay, and if the property of the religious orders and the Catholic population is destroyed.

The Administration has already heeded this grave communication from the Vatican. It has cabled instructions to Dewey and Merritt to suppress the insurgents without mercy if riot and massacre threaten. This was the least that could be done. We cannot feed and fan an insurrection in a foreign land and then wash our hands of the responsibility. We cannot call in savage allies in warfare without shouldering the consequences of their acts. Aguinaldo is reported to be behaving "badly." That means that he wants to fire the rifles we have given him as he pleases, not as we please, and that, with fine assimilation of American political ideas, he is impudently asking what there is "in" all this for him. But that does not alter our duty in the premises. We have made this insubordinate insurgent what he is, and we must lay him by the heels if he proposes, within sight of our forces, to run amuck with torch and sword.

But this particular complication is only a part of the large and puzzling religious problem with which we are certain to be confronted if we retain one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

island or the whole group of the Philippines. Our Protestant missionary societies, which have already had conferences in order to parcel out the work between them, have taken it for granted that the field was one of virgin paganism, so to speak. They did not even seem to be aware that there was such a thing as Catholicism in the Philippines. The fervent Methodists, at the beginning of the war, resolved that it was going to be a righteous and holy war because it would destroy "Romish superstition" in the Spanish West Indies. Not even with such doubtful compliment do the missionary societies speak of the existing religion in the Philippines. They think of those islands only as a hitherto unoccupied mission field, now, in the wonderful Providence of God (with some aid from such humble instruments as Dewey and McKinley), thrown open to them.

But what are the facts? A powerful Christian church is powerfully established in the Philippines. According to the *Études* of Élisée Reclus of July 5, 1898 (quoted in the *Catholic World* for August), the spiritual charges of the various religious communities and the secular clergy are as follows:

1892—Augustinians	2,082,131 souls
1892—Recollects	1,175,156 souls
1892—Franciscans	1,010,753 souls
1892—Dominicans	699,851 souls
1895—Jesuits	213,065 souls
1896—Secular clergy	967,294 souls

In other words, here are some 6,000,000 out of 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 souls in the islands under nominally Christian instruction.

We say nominally Christian, for we are not set for the defence of the friars in the Philippines. There is no doubt that their political influence, there and in Spain, has been mischievous. There is no doubt that, in too many cases, the natives regard them as hated oppressors. Nor have we anything to say as to the merits of their religious tenets and teachings as compared with those of the Protestant societies which intend to supplant them. That Catholicism in the Philippines is not all that it should be, even from the standpoint of an American Catholic, is admitted by a writer in the *Catholic World*. But that is not the point. It is not primarily a religious but a political problem that confronts us in the Philippines. We have to consider the religious element only as it complicates the political problem. And that it does complicate it terribly is beyond question. How are the Catholics in this country going to stomach the practical destruction of the Catholic Church in the Philippines? Are we going to get rid of the Irish vote (thanks to the English *entente*) only to put in its place a Catholic vote? The Pope has already shown that he will not sit idly by and see Philippine Catholicism endangered. Thousands of voters in this country pay Peter's Pence as well as war taxes, and they will not be pleased to see one eat up the other. However we look at it, the religious problem in the Philippines, if we take them, will be most grave, and will affect the political problem there and at home mischievously. In view of this powerful deterrent, added to all the others, against holding the Philippines a day longer than necessary, it does seem as if our rulers might learn wisdom from the little girl who said that pins saved the lives of thousands of people—by not swallowing them.

THE NAVAL OFFICER.

No feature of the present war has impressed the public more favorably than the professional ability of our naval officers, and their devotion to the public service. An *esprit de corps* always of the highest is stimulated by a long line of historic examples, from John Paul Jones to Farragut, to whose names those of more than one of our present naval commanders are likely soon to be added. A body of men whose animating principle is devotion to the honor and glory of their organization never fails to command popular admiration. In the present case one is not less struck by the efficiency and success with which our naval commanders have conducted their operations, than by the eagerness shown by officers of all grades to brave peril whenever the cause could thus be promoted. It is true that the story of victory might have been very different against another antagonist. It is not conceivable that an English, French, or German fleet could have been utterly destroyed with scarcely a life lost or a ship seriously injured on the side of the enemy.

Granting this, it is equally true that we cannot conceive of a fleet of any other nation winning more decisive victories under better-trained commanders. The necessary result of successes so brilliant will be to give the navy a commanding position in public favor, and thus to make the peculiar characteristics of the naval officer a subject of wider interest than ever before. It would be a great mistake to suppose that every such officer is a Dewey, a Sampson, or a Schley. The wisdom of the head of the Navy Department in selecting the best men for high command has been a most essential factor in the whole case. When it is a question of awarding honor, an organization is justly entitled to be judged by its leading men; but in a question of granting power or influence, the general qualities of the organization at large must be considered. Every light has its shade, and every man has his limitations. Indeed, we may go further and say that when a man is rigorously trained from his youth up with exclusive reference to a special duty, he is not likely to prove well fitted to move in a different sphere.

The controlling motive of the best officers of our navy is to make their organization worthy of public support. With this naturally goes a desire to conceal from the public everything that would lessen the repute of the service. Differences so serious as to require adjudication are settled by the commanding officer if possible, by the Navy Department if absolutely necessary, by the public never. An officer who allowed his grievances to become public property would lose caste at once. More than any other branch of the public service the naval is, so far as externals go, exposed to the eyes of foreigners, and the policy of so conducting himself that the world shall see only what is good is a part of the professional training of every well-equipped officer. Hence, to take professional statements and arguments as the sole basis of our judgment of naval efficiency is like making the arguments and opinions of counsel for the defence the sole basis of our judgment of a defendant's guilt or innocence. Is not Lawyer Brown one of the most honorable and high-minded men in the community? Can you for a moment suppose he would argue as he does if he had not carefully examined all the facts, and thus become fully convinced of his client's innocence? We surely cannot know more of the case than he does. The best that we can expect from the professional historian or exponent of naval affairs is to deal with the shortcomings of the service as the Catholic historian deals with the faults and misdeeds of Pope and Church; say as little as possible about them, and as much as possible about the errors of those who judge them harshly.

The *esprit de corps* and professional spirit of our naval service are very largely of internal creation. The official regulations of the Navy Department, complete as they appear to be, are supplemented by an unwritten ethical code which bears the same relation to them that the rules of good breeding bear to the laws of the land. The punishment meted out to violators of this code is, from some points of view, more to be dreaded than official censure. The latter has a definite term, or is productive only of a temporary mortification; the term of the former is unknown. It takes the form of a professional disfavor, which the victim is made to feel without his being able to make any complaint of his treatment. He well knows the cause and so do his friends, and yet if he should raise a question on the subject he would at once be silenced by a call for his authority.

The operation of this code begins with the newly fledged cadet at the Naval Academy. His walk and his behavior towards his senior fellows are fixed by rules that the authorities officially know nothing about, and yet which he must obey. He must never presume to take a seat in the Academy grounds. What would happen to a cadet with the per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal independence to disregard these rules, now that hazing is abolished, it would be hard to say. Probably he would either have to learn better or conclude that the naval service was not to his liking. "I would not submit to such tyranny if I were you," said the father of a fourth-class man. "But, father, just think how nice it will be next year when I am a third-class man." When the practice of hazing was abolished by law, West Point found little difficulty in enforcing compliance; but years of effort with vigorous repressive measures were required at Annapolis. This is only a straw, but it shows the difference of winds at the two institutions.

Notwithstanding all this, we believe that intellectual initiative and independence find a more congenial soil at Annapolis that at its sister institution. In the contest between the old and the new, inaugurated by armored ships and steel guns, our naval authorities were wise enough to side with the new and provide a broad scientific education for the rising generation. But it remains true that there are qualities, not wholly bad, which naval training and naval ethics do not tend to foster. Independence of opinion, freedom of speech, candor, and sincerity are among them. Between the department on the one side and the ethics of the service on the other, the limits of discreet talk on professional topics are necessarily restricted, and the combination of sincerity with discretion may well tax the power of the best-trained officer.

The typical naval officer is far from being the simple-minded man that is sometimes supposed. Using the term "politician" in its best sense, there is no astuter politician than he; none who knows better what to leave unsaid as well as what to say; none who has so delicate a touch for the pulse of public opinion. Full though the journals seem to be of naval news, there is no other branch of the public service of the internal organization of which the mass of intelligent men know so little as of the naval. Every one has seen or read of ships of war, knows what one looks like, how she is armed with big guns and small ones, and how skilfully she is designed for her work. But outside the service proper it would be hard to find in the whole land men qualified to form an independent first-hand opinion of the best measures for promoting economy and efficiency in the administration of a ship of war. What the best-informed men in public life know of the subject is little more than the boiled-down result of a great number of things that they have from time to time been told by interested parties. Our navy needs no trained advocates to present its case to such men. It comes before them with all the prestige of valor, patriotism, and professional ability combined with a sagacity in stating its case equal to that of the best members of the bar.

It would be a serious mistake to suppose that the training of the naval officer fits him for civil administration. The habit of ready command which is his most essential qualification, does not tend to that careful study of details and that deliberation over all sides of a case which are so necessary in the conduct of public business. He can never be a reformer, because the man to play this part must be keenly alive to the abuses to be corrected, and ready to ask public help for their correction—a proceeding which would at once place a naval officer under the ban. No matter how extravagant in expenditure may be a branch of administration with which he is charged, he has nothing to gain by pointing it out, and may have a great deal to lose. It follows that any policy which looks to making him useful outside his strictly professional sphere is a bad one. It is impossible to change at pleasure habits of mind and conduct which have been forming and consolidating for generations. The pressure in favor of the policy is strong, backed as it is by the desire for shore duty on the part of the officer, and the justly high appreciation in which the public holds his professional character. But wisdom points in the other direction, and declares that while the activities of the officer are admirable within his sphere, they cannot be made effective in other departments of administration.

NOT ALDRIDGE, BUT PLATT.

The real culprit in the canal scandal is Thomas C. Platt and his system of government. He selected Mr. Aldridge for Superintendent of Public Works, and induced Gov. Morton, in spite of very strong protest from the reputable press of this State, to appoint him in January, 1895. He also induced Gov. Black to reappoint him in January, 1897. There was no man in the State whose character as a public official was more open or better understood than Mr. Aldridge's was when he was chosen for this place. When his name was first mentioned in connection with it, after Mr. Morton's election in November, 1894, the suggestion was received with general amazement and incredulity. In protesting against it on December 1 of that year the *Tribune* said:

> "The plain fact is, that Mr. Aldridge is not fit for the office of Superintendent of Public Works, and no amount of rhetoric about party fealty and critics' motives can make him so. He has been the local boss of Rochester, and has built up his power with the aid of mercenary Democrats. In that city he represents the kind of politics which the people in Brooklyn and New York have rebuked in the elections of Mayor Schieren and Col. Strong."

This was a very mild and conservative statement of the case. Aldridge as boss and Mayor of Rochester had been one of the most open and defiant spoilsmen that city had ever known. That is why Platt wished to have him put at the head of the Public Works Department. He showed his mettle as soon as he got there. He defied the civil-service regulations, and nothing but a decision of the Court of Appeals against him was sufficient to convince him that he was not above the law. He has never had any other idea of the public service and the public money in charge of an official than that both were to be used primarily for the benefit of politics, and to his credit it should be said that he has never pretended to take any other view. In that respect he is as free from "humbug" and "hypocrisy" as Platt, or Lou Payn, or Croker, or Tom Grady is. He knew perfectly well that he was made Superintendent of Public Works for the purpose of "working the place for all it was worth" in the interest of Platt politics. When the people of the State were beguiled into placing $9,000,000 of their money in his hands for canal improvements, he knew what Platt expected of him.

The report of the investigating commission shows how well Aldridge fulfilled Platt's expectations. He has spent the $9,000,000, largely in poor work, the improvement is not half done, and fully a million dollars has been "improperly" expended. That the "improper" use has been for the benefit of politics, no man can read the report and doubt for a moment. It went for the employment of great gangs of useless and incompetent inspectors, for extravagant advertising in Platt newspapers, for illegal payments to favored contractors who in return therefor helped the Platt machine, for gangs of "muckers" who were hired at election time in order that the State might be made to pay the price of their votes, and in innumerable other ways, all of which were connected more or less directly with the Platt machine. It is absurd to say that Platt and the Governor were not fully aware of what Aldridge has been doing, or that the findings of the commission are a surprise to them. Aldridge must be greatly amused at the Governor's request to the Attorney-General for an opinion upon his conduct. That the Attorney-General, who in his time has supplied on request some very striking Platt "opinions," should shy at this task, is not surprising. It is calculated to stagger even a Whalen.

We say that the Governor has no reason to be surprised, and that is the fact, but he ought to be shaken somewhat in his views of what should constitute fitness in a public official. He took the position in Aldridge's case, and in Lou Payn's, that character was not an essential qualification for positions of high public trust. He sneered in his inaugural address, in more than one of his annual messages, and in his memorandum appended to his famous starchless civil-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service law, against the pharisaical persons who insist too strenuously upon mere common honesty, character, as the first requisite for public office. Aldridge had no character to speak of, but he was "practical," he had "executive capacity," there was no "humbug" about him. Putting aside for the moment all consideration of the moral aspects of his case as it stands revealed in the commission's report, what does the Governor think of the political consequences of having such a man in office? Would it not, on the low level of party policy, be better for the Governor's personal prospects today if he had put an honest, capable man in Aldridge's place when he entered upon the governorship? Is there not something to be said in favor of plain, every-day honesty as a useful thing even in machine politics?

If the Governor is really surprised and shocked by the revelations which his own personally selected commission has made about Aldridge's doings, why does he not at once remove him? Under the law he has full power to do so. He can suspend or remove him whenever in his judgment the public interests so require, merely filing with the Secretary of State a statement of the cause of such removal, and reporting the fact to the next session of the Legislature. Is there not ample cause in the findings of the commission? Why does the Governor hesitate? Why does not Mr. Platt come out with an indignant demand for Aldridge's removal? Can it be that he fears that Aldridge might "squeal" if he were to be removed? There are certainly reasons in the testimony taken by the commission for inferring his ability to do this effectively. For instance, on page 66 of the report there is an extremely interesting correspondence which shows that one Flynn, a representative of the Platt Family Surety Company, which, under the guidance of Son Henry, did a roaring business in canal-contract bonds, was able to exert such a "pull" upon the State Engineer in favor of a contractor who had taken out Platt bonds that he had 6,000 cubic yards of "earth" reclassified and paid for as "rock," getting $1.25 per cubic yard instead of 24 cents, for which he had contracted to do the work. The commission says this was an "improper" transaction, and it seems open to that construction. Was Mr. Platt surprised when he heard of this, and was it an isolated case in Aldridge's distribution of the millions of improperly used State money? If the Governor will remove Aldridge immediately from office, we may get some light on this interesting point.

CORRUPTION IN OFFICE.

Inefficiency and corruption seem to be the two causes to which mankind generally attributes the Spanish defeat, and, of course, inefficiency is a necessary consequence of corruption. But governments in which there is a great deal of corruption sometimes are able to put very efficient armies into the field. Turkey did so last year against Greece, when there was plenty of corruption on both sides, and Rome retained her military power long after the body politic had become absolutely rotten. The *Spectator*, moralizing on the subject, suggests that in southern Europe corruption is fostered and sheltered by a general legal cause —the exemption of the agents of the state from responsibility to the ordinary tribunals. But the area of corruption, if we may use the phrase, is a good deal wider than southern Europe. It covers at least the whole of Russia, Turkey, China, and the entire East, South America, Central America, and Mexico—that is, the greater part of the entire world. On the other hand, how far agents of the state are responsible to the ordinary tribunals in Germany and the few other northern European countries that we have not mentioned, may be a question. We doubt if there is much difference in this respect between Prussia and France. A more serious question would be, How far is the fact that agents of the state are with us responsible to the ordinary tribunals an adequate explanation of our superiority so far as it exists?

The English and American principle that the agents of the state are responsible to the ordinary tribunals is a very old one, but it has primarily to do, not with official corruption, but with the protection of the citizen. A suit against a sheriff for improper seizure of property, or against a collector of customs for wrong assessment of duties, or such a suit as that brought by Mr. Rockefeller against the assessors of the town in which he lives for excessive taxation, is illustrative of this principle. But such suits do not necessarily involve corruption in office. The Rockefeller case, indeed, is based partly on a charge of "malice," which in a person occupying a judicial position such as that of assessor is akin to corruption; but nothing is more certain than that, speaking generally, the liability of administrative officers at common law to suits by persons who allege wrongs at their hands, does not operate directly to make the punishment of corruption easy.

As a general rule in the United States, and we believe in England, official corruption is not punished in the ordinary tribunals, and, even when so punished, there is no responsibility until some agency of the state has been called in to enforce it. That is, the agent of the state is punished by some other agent of the state, just as he would be in the south of Europe or in China. Of course, the tribunal itself is an agency of the state; but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the prosecution is set on foot by the District Attorney or Attorney-General, or through him by the Governor or other executive. In the present canal scandal, it is Mr. Black (an agent of the state) who calls upon Mr. Hancock (another agent of the state) to act. In the old canal scandals Gov. Tilden was the moving party. Tweed was regularly convicted in an ordinary criminal trial. In one large class of cases, those involving the official corruption of officers of the United States, the ordinary tribunals are not allowed to act, and the procedure of impeachment, a species of trial in which the judges are one set of state agents and the prosecutors another, is provided. In all these cases the consent of one agent of the state has to be obtained in order that another may be punished, exactly as would be the case in Spain or France.

The real difference between the machinery provided to check corruption in England and America and in so many other countries lies not so much in the fact that we subject the agents of the state to the ordinary tribunals, as in the fact that we have broken up the vicious system under which the judges and the Legislature are agents of the executive. In Spain and in the whole Spanish-American world the judge on his bench and the Deputy in his chamber are more or less the servants of the executive, premier, or dictator. The assembly is not free to deliberate, the judicial tribunal is not free to judge. This system produces corruption, just as slavery produces cruelty. Corruption supplies the oil which keeps the machinery in motion. The corrupt official is not punished, because his corruption would be necessarily imputed to the head of the state. The best proof of this is found in the fact that those very branches of the English Government which are to-day free from corruption were, a hundred and fifty years ago, when bench and Parliament were still more or less creatures of the executive, steeped in corruption.

Go back to the old system—for it is the oldest in the world—and you can readily produce corruption anywhere. This is what we have done in New York, as far as possible. What we call the "machine," whenever it exists in a perfect form, is simply the merging of all the functions of government in one control, though we have added the curious feature, unknown elsewhere, of having the head outside the state altogether. Through his control of the nominating bodies, which is a pecuniary control, a boss like Croker appoints judges and members of Assembly and the Mayor and the heads of departments and the District Attorney. When he cannot quite accomplish this, he divides the offices with another boss, Platt, equally irresponsible, and the two have this made legal by a Legislature consisting of their own creatures, by means of a statute calling the division "bi-partisan." It is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obvious that under such a system there can be no such thing as punishment for corruption, because one corrupt agent of the state has to get the consent not merely of another corrupt agent of the state, but of the powerful beneficiary of the whole system, to begin proceedings. We have to live in hope that some honest man may turn up strong enough to attack the machine and set us free from it.

MICHELET AND THE COLLEGE OF FRANCE.

PARIS, July 25, 1898.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the celebration this year of the French national fête was the commemoration of the centenary of Michelet's birth, the series of ceremonies closing yesterday with the highly successful musical and spectacular performance on the square in front of the Hôtel de Ville. The event has naturally called forth numerous speeches, articles, and letters dwelling on the labors and life of the great historian. One episode in his troubled and busy existence seems, however, to have received but little attention. I refer to Michelet's stormy relations with the College of France. But M. Wilfrid de Fonvielle, the venerable French aeronaut and popularizer of the sciences, is engaged on a paper which is to do full justice to this chapter in Michelet's career.

It was in 1838 that Michelet was appointed to the chair of history and moral science at the College of France, and the democratic tone of his utterances and the severe strictures on the Jesuits which he indulged in soon made him extremely popular with the young men of the Latin Quarter. But at the same time he incurred the displeasure of the Government of Louis Philippe, which was abandoning more and more the liberal policy that had characterized the July Monarchy at its origin as it gradually approached the moment of the catastrophe in which it perished. This tendency was revealed in the successive suppression of the lectures of Mickiewicz and Quinet at the College of France, and culminated in the suspension, in January, 1848, of those of Michelet. And yet the Prime Minister of France was Guizot, the austere Protestant, who had been Michelet's master in historical science, whose substitute at the Sorbonne Michelet had been a few years before, and who had himself been struck down in almost exactly the same way nearly a quarter of a century before, under the Restoration, while filling the chair of history at the Sorbonne.

It was impossible to get the Ministers to say just why the lectures of Michelet were suspended, though it was rumored that the measure was due to disturbances which occurred in the lecture-room one day before the professor had arrived. That the Government's action was impolitic soon became evident, and it was certainly one of the important minor causes of the Revolution of 1848. When Michelet, who, for several weeks, had been expecting what had now happened, was informed of the Government's decision by the Administrator of the College of France, he acknowledged the letter in a firm reply which was intended for the public rather than for the scholar to whom it was addressed, and which was immediately printed in the Opposition papers. It contained this sentence: "From Mickiewicz to Quinet and from Quinet to me is a *coup d'état* in three acts." The *Réforme*, one of the boldest mouthpieces of the advanced party, followed Michelet's letter with these words: "Here disappears the last of our free tribunes," and the next day it too spoke of the measure as "a sort of *coup d'état*," while an orator at one of the Reform Banquets which precipitated the Revolution of 1848, held at this same moment at Toulouse, referred at some length to the incident and closed by saying: "The System moves on towards its fatal destiny."

Michelet's mouth was not to be shut so easily as that. They had closed the door of his lecture-hall, but he still held his pen. Besides his powerful letter to the Administrator, he also announced in the public prints under his own name that his weekly lectures would henceforth appear in the form of pamphlets issued every seven days. But it was the students themselves who made the most of this new arm put in their hands by the short-sighted Government, which had now stirred up a veritable hornet's nest. As the day came around when the usual lecture should be delivered, some two thousand hot-headed young men met, at the very hour when Michelet was accustomed to begin, in the big square in front of the Panthéon, and drew up an address which ended with these words: "We shall always carry in our hearts the names of those who combat for liberty, truth, and the rights of all." They then marched to their honored teacher's house, which was hard by, and, finding him out, paraded peacefully through the streets of the city. "Half Paris witnessed this demonstration," remarks the *National*.

This address was followed by a protest, also from the student body, which appeared in the newspapers of January 5, 1848, and which finished with these prophetic words: "The time of liberty is near, and woe to those who try to strangle it." A day or two afterwards they sent a petition to the Chamber of Deputies praying that Mickiewicz, Quinet, and Michelet be restored to their chairs. It was signed by nearly three thousand students, who, when they marched to the Palais-Bourbon to deliver it, found drawn up on the quay a large number of municipal horse-guards, scores of ordinary policemen, and a regiment of cavalry with unsheathed swords, showing that the Government feared trouble. Crémieux, who a few weeks later was a member of the Provisional Government, came out from the Chamber, as prearranged, addressed the young men, accepted their petition, carried it in and laid it on the President's table. They then retired, but before disbanding visited some of the newspaper offices friendly to the liberal cause. M. de Fonvielle writes, in an unpublished letter: "The greater number of those who took part in this demonstration figured in the column which came down from the Panthéon on February 22, and began the Revolution." And M. de Fonvielle knows whereof he speaks, for in this same letter he says: "I was present at Micheletis lectures, at the demonstration on January 6, and at that of February 22. I took part in the Revolution."

Nor did the agitation stop here. At the same time that the regular attendants on Michelet's lectures were protesting in every form, the "liberal Catholic students" (as they designated themselves) were also up and doing. They, too, sent a petition to the Chamber in which one reads: "We have never been friendly to Michelet nor afraid of him, but we cannot see justice and liberty violated, even in the person of our adversaries, without protesting. . . . We join our prayers, therefore, to those of our fellow-students, differing with them in opinion, but in accord with them as regards the sacred principles of liberty and justice." Simultaneously, M. Charles de Rémusat laid on the table of the President of the Chamber of Deputies a third request called forth by the attack on Michelet, signed, in this case, by more than sixty college professors, praying that a guarantee be given of the independence of the teaching body.

In the midst of this growing agitation, and before these petitions could be considered by the Chamber and a grand debate brought on, which would surely have been another powerful blow at the prestige of the rapidly sinking Government, the Revolution of February suddenly burst upon the country. Universal suffrage was established, the slaves in the French colonies set free, and liberty, equality, fraternity became the device of the political millennium. Of course, the wrongs of Michelet were righted. On March 6 he and Quinet reopened their lecture courses. The jubilant ceremony did not occur, however, at the College of France, which had no room big enough to hold the delighted youth of the Latin Quarter, now delirious over their double victory, but in the famous old amphitheatre of the Sorbonne, the very hall in which Guizot had had his own voice gagged, and which has recently been swept away to give place to the magnificent buildings of the new University of Paris. Three chairs were set side by side on the platform—one for Mickiewicz, which remained empty, as he was in Italy, a second for Quinet, and the third for Michelet. Quinet spoke first, and began in these words: "Royalty closed our lecture-rooms, but the republic has opened them." He was followed by Michelet, who declared that the students of Paris, by their demonstration in favor of the condemned lectures of the College of France, had given the signal for the Revolution. "The statement was absolutely true," says M. de Fonvielle, in the letter already quoted, "for the success of that demonstration suggested the idea of crowning the campaign of the Banquets by that of the Twelfth Ward, which caused the insurrection of February 22, and was the beginning of the struggle."

Michelet was not left very long in peace at the College of France. The Republic of 1848, like the July monarchy—in fact, like all the governments which have succeeded one another in this country since the upheaval of 1789, not excepting even the existing one—began to deteriorate and enter upon the tyrannical stage which always precedes a political syncope. In a word, Michelet fell an early victim to the rising star of Louis Napoleon. "The suppression of his lectures in 1851," says M. de Fonvielle—for it was in fact this time a permanent "suppression" and not a momentary "suspension," as in 1848, since Michelet never again lectured at the College of France—"was an act of violence like many of those committed at that moment when the *Coup d'État* was in the air, and the prison-ships were being got ready to receive us. It was an incident of no importance." While it is quite true that this second persecution was of no importance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in its political bearing, as compared with the preceding measure, it was of vital moment to Michelet, who was placed by it, and the consequences resulting from it, on the verge of starvation; so that there was no exaggeration in the utterance of one of the speakers at the ceremony held a few days ago, before the historian's tomb in Père Lachaise Cemetery—"If Michelet did not die of hunger, it was not the fault of his contemporaries."

Another feature of this same incident also possesses some interest. I refer to the part played in it by the late Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, who was Administrator of the College of France when Michelet's chair was suppressed. The following statement was made to me by M. Saint-Hilaire and revised by him a year or two before his death. In reading it, one should bear in mind that, during the Republic of 1848, M. Saint-Hilaire, who was a Deputy, voted with the moderate wing of the Republicans and sometimes even with the Right, though later he took a firm stand, worthy of his best moments, and turned his back on the Second Empire:

"Michelet mingled too much politics with the other elements of his lectures," M. Saint-Hilaire began, "to please his associates of the College of France. So he was summoned to appear before the officers of the College, a committee composed of myself as chairman, Laboulaye, secretary, and one or two other professors. He was charged with two faults. In the first place, each professor was expected to lecture at least thirty times during the university year, whereas Michelet failed some years to lecture at all, and during the years when he did appear, he averaged only eleven lectures. The excuse which he offered was his severe literary labor and his researches in the public libraries and national archives.

"The second and graver charge was his not confining himself to history and moral science, the real title of his chair, and his branching off into the field of every-day politics. The committee said to him: 'If the professor of mathematics were to take up botany, we should complain. In the same way we find fault with your course.' Michelet offered certain explanations in extenuation of his conduct, which, however, were not satisfactory to the committee, and he was finally cited to appear before the general assemblage of the professors of the College. We met on the appointed day and at the appointed hour, but waited in vain for Michelet to present himself. He did not come, but published a defence in the newspapers. Thereupon the assemblage voted that he be requested to meet his peers the very next day, and that in case he should not heed the summons, he should be summarily judged and condemned *in contumaciam*.

"In the meantime I had attended some of Michelet's lectures, and convinced myself that they had nothing to do with the subject on which he was supposed to speak. I even had a sworn stenographer take down, word for word, two of the lectures, and the long-hand copy of his notes was laid before the professors when Michelet appeared. Having read the reports, he denied the correctness of one of them, but admitted that the other expressed his thoughts in his own language."

At this point in his narration, M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire gave, with much relish, the substance of this lecture, imitating Michelet's high-pitched, rather effeminate voice, his ample gestures, and his flowery language. This mimicry was excellent and very funny; in fact, extraordinary in a man almost a nonagenarian. Michelet, it appears, had a way of lowering his head and of swinging it from side to side when speaking, and Saint-Hilaire did not forget to reproduce this peculiarity. He closed the scene by announcing that eighteen out of the twenty-two professors voted for Michelet's suppression.

I must say that while Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire was giving me this lively account, I was thinking of another conversation which I had had with him and which was far more to his honor. It ran as follows:

"The manner in which I became Administrator of the College of France well illustrates my theory that if you do the best you can for others, quite regardless of your own interest at the time, they will eventually turn to seek your aid and to confer honors on you with a view to their own advantage.

"Thus, at the beginning of the Republic of 1848, Hippolyte Carnot, then Minister of Public Instruction, wished to remove from his chair in the College of France Michel Chevalier, said to be compromised by some questionable financial transactions. I considered this a very bad way of getting rid of an objectionable professor. After due deliberation and in order that it should not appear that this act of severity was aimed particularly at M. Chevalier, the Minister decided to push aside, at the same time, four other professors, who were to be replaced by as many good Republicans. This increasing of the number of victims did not remove from my mind my dislike for the method, and as I was a Deputy at that time as well as a professor at the College of France, I determined to combat the measure, notwithstanding the fact that I was the Secretary of the Government. So I moved in the Assembly that the professors be restored to their chairs, and that their back salary be paid to them, all of which was done. The administrative post becoming vacant shortly afterwards, the professors, in recognition of what I had accomplished for them, proposed to the new Minister of Public Instruction, Count de Falloux, that I be placed at the head of the institution, which was also done."

And yet, a few months later, as I have related, this same Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire took the lead in having one of his own colleagues expelled from the College of France, ostensibly for violating the rules of the institution, but in reality for political reasons.

THEODORE STANTON.

MME. DARMESTETER'S RENAN.

PARIS, July 27, 1898.

I am not surprised that the 'Life of Ernest Renan,' by Madame Darmesteter, should have already been reprinted in a second edition. This success is not owing solely to the name of Renan, but also to the real merit of the work. Madame Darmesteter is, as is well known, of English origin—Miss Mary Robinson before her marriage with the late distinguished French professor and linguist, James Darmesteter. Certain expressions, certain peculiarities of style and shades of thought betray the foreigner, but on the whole Madame Darmesteter writes in excellent French and is familiar with all the delicacies of the French language.

It required, perhaps, the pen of a woman, of a very refined woman, to give a good account of the complex character of Renan, but it was necessary that this woman should have a very superior intellect, and that she should be capable of moving freely in the world of thought in which the powerful mind of Renan moved. It was necessary, also, that she should be capable of seeing through Renan, so to speak—of discovering in him what was fundamental and what was merely accidental; and of feeling a sort of profound sympathy with the new form of scepticism of which Renan was the living expression—a scepticism which may be called a religious scepticism, in opposition to the irreligious scepticism of Voltaire and the school of the philosophers of the eighteenth century.

Renan's origin explains the character of religiosity which imbued all his work. Madame Darmesteter has charming pages on Tréguier, the Celtic birthplace of Renan, on his family, on his sister Henrietta, whom she calls his guardian angel. Henrietta was already twelve years old when Renan was born in the winter of 1823. She is thus described by Madame Darmesteter:

"She had little in common with her mother; she was neither vivacious, nor witty, nor pretty. A birthmark disfigured the lower part of a face whose features preserved, however, a charming *morbidezza*. Her forehead was pale, her eyes had a rare softness, her hands were white, long, and fine. She was very intelligent, of a high and pure character in a serene reserve."

Renan was five years old when the body of his father was found on the seashore; it was never known whether the death of the old sea-captain was by accident or suicide. He left many debts, and his widow had to give up her house to the creditors. Henrietta, in order to make money, accepted a place in an educational house in Paris. The boy was educated in an ecclesiastical seminary. "I owe," he said afterwards, "to priests all that is good in me. . . . They taught me the love of truth, respect for reason, the seriousness of life. . . . Old and dear masters, whose images often appear in my dreams, not as a reproach, but as a fond memory, I have not been as unfaithful to you as you believe." Renan has given us some of his best pages on his college and on the church at Tréguier.

From Brittany he went to Paris to the school of Saint-Nicolas. He was educated for the Church; but his sister Henrietta, his spiritual guide, had become an unbeliever. "Her opinions tormented her when she visited her brother, every week, in the parlor of the little seminary. She feared to see her child bind himself, at the age of fifteen, by a perpetual engagement. More than once she bade Ernest reflect on the irrevocable character of the sacerdotal vow; but she never said a word which could directly wound his faith." At that period of her life Henrietta was obliged to leave France; she accepted a place as governess in Poland in 1841. In her exile at Clemensow she remained her brother's confidante.

In 1842 Renan left Saint-Nicolas for Issy, the country-place of the great seminary of Saint-Sulpice. We have admirable pages of Renan's on the years which marked the crisis of his life, the transition from belief to unbelief. He studied German philosophy, and thought "that he was entering a temple." No life appeared to him so fine as that of a priest. "The sublimity of the priestly office has always struck me. Even if Christianity were but a dream, the office would still be a divine type." He asks himself if the priest is obliged to believe all that he teaches, and writes to Henrietta: "It is so hard to think only for yourself. . . . You should have a thought behind, as Pascal says, and judge from that, though you speak like the people." Henrietta was more sincere, and did not approve this dilettantism. Renan entered the great seminary of Saint-Sulpice, still resolved to take orders. His studies of Hebrew and of German exegesis decided his destiny. He found in questions of dates, of texts, the historical proofs which confirmed his doubts. After many perplexities, he stopped, to use the words of Bishop Dupanloup,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the foot of the altar and left the seminary.

His clerical friends did not abandon him, hoping still to bring him back to the Church. They procured for him a place in a half-clerical, half-lay institution; but he did not remain in it, and entered as *maître d'études* an obscure lay establishment, where he had to work for his board and received no salary. He was very unhappy in his new environment. In the little world of the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève, he found nothing to compare to the excellent men whom he had left and of whom he speaks with so much affection in his 'Souvenirs.' He had thought too well of the outside world; its mediocrity and vulgarity wounded every fibre of his nature. He found, fortunately, a friend in a young man of eighteen, Marcellin Berthelot. They lived in the same house and shared their hopes and ambitions in common. Their correspondence, which was published not long ago, shows well the difference in their two natures. "As Renan," says Madame Darmesteter, "was instinctively Breton and religious, so was Berthelot (a Parisian by birth) a democrat and a rationalist." Berthelot had been brought up among scientific people, devoted himself to science, and believed only in science. He did not understand the extraordinary depth of the religious feeling in his friend. He had an ardent faith in the future of science. They had both an innate love of truth, but they saw it under different angles and aspects. "Renan, philosopher, philologist, exegete, theologian, knew nothing as yet of those splendid certainties of physical science, of chemistry, of positive science, of which his friend spoke to him." He was, however, seduced. "If Spinoza was said to have been intoxicated with God, Renan became intoxicated with the universe. The echo of these conversations in the winter nights of 1845 is heard through all his works. As fast as the last veils of Catholicism fell from his eyes, like a torn curtain, Renan saw, in their place, the whole glory of Cosmos." He felt himself becoming the priest of a new universal religion. His doubts had left him; he decided to begin his Semitic studies anew. He presented in 1847 to the Academy of Inscriptions the manuscript of his 'General History of the Semitic Languages,' a philological work which seemed very audacious at the time.

The commotion of the Revolution of 1848 had also its influence on him. He was essentially a man of peace and of order; but he was a philosopher and capable of penetrating the causes of revolution. "We must not," he says, "view too near these great convulsions of humanity. The appearance of Christianity appears to us altogether pure, holy, and supernatural; so it was, in fact, but only in its entirety. Could we view it very near, should we not find many spots in it? How many crazy, extravagant, immoral, monstrous sects. . . ." He would like to compose a new society; to elevate and purify the people; for, such as it is, it is impossible to love it or to desire its triumph. This idea torments him, and he exposes it in his 'Avenir de la Science,' written after 1848, but published only many years later.

In 1849 he was sent on a scientific mission to Italy, and on his return he declares himself another man. "The Madonnas have vanquished me." He felt that science was not all, that art was a world in itself. He had left France full of socialistic ideas; he felt that what he had written after 1848 was too bitter, too dogmatic, too sectarian and hard. Art appeared to him like a fairy, "who told me what the Church said, in one of its hymns, to the wood of the Cross:

> "'Flecte ramos, arbor alta,
> Tensa laxa viscera,
> Et rigor lentescat ille
> Quem dedit nativitas.'

A sort of mild zephyr softened my severity; nearly all my illusions of 1848 fell, as impossibilities. I saw the fatal necessities of human society."

Renan obtained a place in the department of manuscripts of the National Library. His sister Henrietta joined him in September, 1850. With a few thousand francs a year they could live together in Paris. She had become old before her time in Poland; they took a modest apartment in the Rue du Val de Grâce, near a convent of Carmelites in which sleeps Louise de la Vallière. Henrietta was her brother's secretary. She collected notes for him, read documents, helped him in everything; she wrote herself for an educational review, edited by Mademoiselle Ulliac. Renan's first publication was 'Averroès,' which was written for the doctorship of letters. It appeared in 1852. In 1855 the 'History of the Semitic Languages' appeared in print, and, the year after, Renan was elected a member of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. He became a regular contributor to the *Journal des Débats* and to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. In 1857 appeared the 'Études d'Histoire Religieuse,' and in 1859 the 'Essais de Morale et de Critique.'

He made, in the studio of Ary Scheffer, the acquaintance of the niece of the Dutch painter. Madame Darmesteter has need of all her talent to make us understand what difficulties Renan encountered in escaping the tender tyranny of his sister and in taking a wife. "The hour in which Henrietta conceived the first suspicion of the secret sentiment of her brother towards Scheffer's niece was followed by cruel recriminations, by revolt, by all the bitterness to be found in a wounded soul." Renan has himself alluded to this domestic tragedy in the little work dedicated to "my sister Henrietta." He announced to Mademoiselle Scheffer that he would see her no more if the heart of his sister did not cease to bleed. He announced his resolution to his sister, who felt remorse and went herself to see Mademoiselle Scheffer. Everything was arranged; they were to continue all to live together; her economies would swell the budget of the young people. "Often, however," says Madame Darmesteter, "did the torments, the uneasiness of the imperious and tender sister threaten the domestic happiness. Fortunately the young bride possessed adorable constancy, simplicity, equableness. Thanks to her, all got on. She was born in the liberty of Protestant, liberal, artistic surroundings. She never complained of the severity of her new home; never did a bitter word show that she was not the sole mistress. She only wished to be the wife of Ernest Renan, the little sister of Henrietta. So much abnegation could but have its effect."

Correspondence.

JUDGING COLLEGE DEBATES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Some considerations seem to me to weigh heavily against Mr. Ringwalt's suggestion in regard to the principle of decision in intercollegiate debates. That suggestion, if I interpret it rightly, means that judges should go outside of the arguments presented and estimate the relative merits of debaters by comparing their actual performance with the utmost that might possibly be made of their side. In this way the accident of having a weak case will be compensated for, and failure to make the most of a strong case will be duly taken into account.

Obviously, judges competent to make allowance for the relative strength of two sides of a question must be profoundly learned in the subject discussed. Otherwise, their reckoning of the strength and weakness of the opposite sides will depend upon their own general impressions and the showing made by the disputants. The untrustworthiness of both sources of information need not be insisted upon.

The restriction to specialists of the field from which judges may be chosen would greatly diminish the small supply of available men and would not insure freedom from professional bias. The complication of the already complicated duty of a judge which would result from the adoption of this plan would render just decisions very difficult. At present a judge is supposed to divest himself of prejudice in listening to an argument, and to render his decision in favor of the debaters who would leave an impartial and intelligent listener, unacquainted with the merits of the question, in the belief that they seemed to be in the right. It is no easy matter to obtain judges who can do this. A correspondent suggests judges in law-courts as peculiarly fitted to be judges in debate; but I should not have liked in 1800 to argue for a prize before English judges in favor of the mitigation of penalties for crime, nor should I now like to defend before a bench of judges a proposition for any very far-reaching change in public policy. Again, if the decision is to be reached by the application of any subtler principle than power to induce belief in the mind of an unprejudiced listener, then personal notions about style, voice, attitude, cannot but receive dangerous attention from the judges.

The proposed change fails to render imperative mature consideration of the substance and phraseology of the question propounded. Only so long as there is something to be gained by having the stronger case, will De Quincey's rule for sharing an orange—you divide and I choose—be applicable to debate. The selection of a subject and the phrasing of a proposition are as truly parts of a debate as are the massing of evidence and the analysis of syllogisms. If debaters propose an uneven subject, or get on the wrong side of one, they ought to lose. Subjects which are nearly even can be found. Conscientious, learned, and able men are on both sides of nearly every great political question. The Supreme Court has decided cases by a majority of one. Approximate equality is sufficient as a practical test of the power of debaters. Seldom, indeed, will the opponents be so nicely matched that the estimation of a hair in the weight of the cause will turn the balance in favor of a side.

Any standard of judgment which obscures the fact that argument is to convince and persuade induces artificiality and insincerity. Prize contests are only too easily degraded into exhibitions. Showy metaphors, pompous generalizations, declamatory in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flections, affected voices, everything to humiliate those who still believe that rhetoric in the classic sense is a respectable study, will surely result when skill, and not power, is made the test of excellence. The conditions of an intercollegiate debate are artificial at best. Can we afford to make them more so?—Yours very respectfully,

H. B. LATHROP.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, July 25, 1898.

Notes.

Charles Scribner's Sons have in press Henry Cabot Lodge's 'Story of the Revolution,' which has been running in their magazine; 'War Memories of an Army Chaplain,' by Henry Clay Trumbull, D.D.; 'The Story of Spain Briefly Told,' by Mary Platt Parmelee; 'Our Navy in the Spanish War,' by John R. Spears; a new edition of 'The Navy in the Civil War'; 'A History of Modern Europe,' by Ferdinand Schwill, instructor in the University of Chicago; 'Thomas Gainsborough: His Life and Works,' by Walter Armstrong of the British Museum; a new volume of Donald G. Mitchell's 'American Lands and Letters'; 'Causes and Consequences,' a social and political essay, by John Jay Chapman; 'Architectural Essays,' by W. P. P. Longfellow; 'Fashion and Fashions in Paris,' by Octave Uzanne, with 100 full-page colored text and 230 text illustrations by François Courbin; 'Music and Manners from Pergolese to Beethoven,' by Henry Edward Krehbiel; by the same author, Henry T. Finck, W. J. Henderson, W. F. Apthorp, and others, "The Music Lovers' Library," a series of popular volumes; 'Odes in Contribution to the Song of French History,' by George Meredith; 'Worldly Ways and By-Ways,' essays from the *Evening Post* by Eliot Gregory ("An Idler"); 'Rome,' by Reinhold Schoener, with 300 full-page (quarto) illustrations; 'In the Highest Andes,' by Edward A. Fitz-Gerald, F.R.G.S., with sixty full-page illustrations from the author's photographs; 'The Workers—The West,' by Walter A. Wyckoff; and 'A Study of English Prose Writers,' by Prof. J. Scott Clark of the Northwestern University. The same firm has in preparation the 'Life and Letters of Eugene Field,' by Slason Thompson.

A volume of short stories by the late Edward Bellamy, with a biographical sketch by Sylvester Baxter, will be published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Doubleday & McClure Co. will shortly publish 'Songs of Action,' by Conan Doyle, and 'Military Europe,' by Gen. Nelson A. Miles, with illustrations.

Dodd, Mead & Co. will issue in the fall 'The Grenadier: A Story of the Empire,' by James Eugene Farmer.

'Ada Vernham, Actress,' a novel by Richard Marsh, is in the press of John Long, London.

Supplementary to the "Rulers of India" series, the Clarendon Press will bring out the 'Life of Sir Henry Lawrence, the Pacificator,' by Lieut.-Gen. J. J. McLeod Innes, with portrait and map.

In the July *Publications* of the Southern History Association (Washington) it is stated that the trustees of Clemson College, S. C., who hold the larger part of the correspondence of John C. Calhoun, will commit it to the hands of Prof. J. Franklin Jameson of Brown University, representing the American Historical Manuscripts Commission, for publication in the next Report of the American Historical Association. Prof. Jameson, whose address is No. 196 Bowen Street, Providence, R. I., will be thankful for the loan of Calhoun letters and other pertinent unpublished material to assist him in his editorial enterprise.

The well-selected "Stories by Foreign Authors" of the Messrs. Scribner continue in two volumes, Scandinavian and Russian, with portrait frontispieces of Turgeneff and Björnson. The Russian collection is typical enough—Pushkin, Gogol, Turgeneff, and Tolstoi. Frederika Bremer is not forgotten in the Scandinavian.

Appletons' 'Dictionary of "Greater" New York' is the amended title of the twentieth edition of a well-known and convenient guide to this city. The new bounds are not shown in detail on any one map, the borough of Manhattan alone being reserved for this distinction. Evidences of the thorough overhauling made necessary by the expansion of New York are abundant. There are not a few half-tone illustrations.

Most people who have read any of Mr. Poultney Bigelow's previous writings will know about what to expect to find in 'White Man's Africa' (Harpers). At the request of his publishers, soon after the Jameson raid, the author went to South Africa to obtain "impressions" wherewith to enlighten the American public. He has done his job thoroughly—indeed, almost every page is full of impressions delivered with refreshing certainty. He travelled through the several states; he interviewed two presidents and a prime minister or so, besides many lesser lights; he tried to read "all" of the literature on South Africa. Hence, there remained for him no mysteries in the problems that vex the country. Altogether, it was a true piece of journalism, with its merits. The book is well written, bright and entertaining, even at times suggestive; the wealth of historical parallels is impressive, and why should we scan them too closely? We get pictures of interesting scenes and characters, while never too much losing sight of the writer. No bibliography of South Africa will be complete without this work.

'The Benin Massacre,' by Alan Boisragon (London: Methuen), is an account of a recent episode in the history of British West Africa, the murder of a party of English officers with their attendants by a treacherous native chief. Only two of the nine white men escaped, and they as by a miracle, after undergoing fearful suffering and privation. The story is told by the author, one of the survivors, with a straightforward artlessness which is at times quite effective, so that we enjoy the couple of hours necessary to read the book. Of course, the massacre was followed by the usual successful punitive expedition.

Burmah, the last great acquisition to the Indian empire of Great Britain, is still little known. Its rich natural resources are almost totally undeveloped, and since its recent pacification it has not yet attracted many visitors or provoked widespread interest. Hence its long if rather uninteresting history and its peculiar character and civilization, in which India and China meet, have hardly begun to be studied. Mrs. Ernest Hart, in 'Picturesque Burma, Past and Present' (Philadelphia: Lippincott), has tried to write a systematic work, based on the best available authorities rather than on her own travels. The scope is shown by the division into five parts—"The Country of Burma," "The People of Burma and their Customs," "The Religion of the Burmans," "The Story of Burma for Twenty-five Centuries," and "The Resources and Future of Burma." Such an attempt is ambitious, perhaps too ambitious in the present case, for the author does not seem to have the grasp, the power of arrangement, selection, and deduction necessary for a great or even a particularly good book of this sort. The result is, nevertheless, praiseworthy, and can be useful to many, if such there be, who are anxious to learn about things Burmese. The volume is well printed, handsomely illustrated, and prettily bound; indeed, is evidently intended to look well on a table, as it is far too heavy to be comfortable in the hand.

The Pocket and the Student's Dictionaries by Ferdinand E. A. Gasc have prepared a welcome for the same author's 'Library Dictionary of the French and English Languages' (Henry Holt & Co.). To speak first of externals, the two parts consist of 950 pages, the matter in triple columns of small but legible type, with full-page catchwords. Beyond a few indications, the pronunciation is left to be acquired independently. Derivation is equally disregarded. The vocabulary for the current speech is remarkably full, as one may see by comparing it with that of Hatzfeld-Darmesteter. Of especial excellence and abundance, as should be the case, are the definitions, which are laudably idiomatic. A very good illustration of the help to be obtained from Gasc is afforded by the words *badaud* and *badauderie*, which, from the meagre and formal definitions in Littré or Hatzfeld, would tax ordinary wit to find an English equivalent for without great circumlocution. In a word, this Dictionary must recommend itself even as an adjunct to any other of its class now available. The price is moderate.

Professor Kluge, well known as one of the first of living Germanic philologists, has associated with himself Professor F. Lutz of Albion College in the preparation of a little manual entitled 'English Etymology' (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.). The book is correctly described in the title-page as "a select glossary, serving as an introduction to the history of the English language." It is not, of course, meant as a substitute for a large etymological dictionary, but within its compass it is very full, and it is throughout distinguished by clearness and scientific elegance. It ought to be in the hands of every person who cares for the history of our tongue. For teachers of English who are not fully trained in such matters it is downright indispensable.

It is a timely deviation of Knackfuss's "Künstler-Monographien" from the old masters which gives us one on the living Franz Lenbach, by Adolf Rosenberg (Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing; New York: Lemcke & Buechner). This artist is *par excellence* the portraitist of the German empire of to-day, and is known everywhere for his portraits of Bismarck in particular. Numerous examples of this series, along with Dr. Schweninger, accompany the monograph; but also the first and second German Emperors and their families, Moltke and Delbrück, Wagner and Liszt, Von Bülow and Johann Strauss, Helmholtz and Max von Pettenkofer, Döllinger and the Pope, Paul Heyse and Hermann Lingg, Arnold Böcklin and Franz

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

von Seitz, together with many women of station or beauty, are shown in paintings or drawings. Gladstone, too, is here, whose death in the same year with Bismarck still further couples their names as their lives. The English statesman is shown both singly and in that queer post-mortem group with Döllinger which recalls the two shades in Aldrich's "No-man's-land," vainly inquiring after each other's identity:

> "'I know not,' said the second Shape,
> 'I only died last night!'"

The third of G. Hedeler's (Leipzig) trilingual 'List of Private Libraries' deals with Germany, and enumerates no fewer than 817, whose characteristics are briefly set forth. Collections in excess of 10,000 volumes are plentiful, and several surpass 100,000. There is an index of places, and another of specialties, but these last are arranged by class and not alphabetically.

The numerous "Anleitungen" and "praktische Wegweiser" for university students in Germany are a result of the prevailing lack of close relations between professor and student which often prevents the former from being the guide of his hearers as well as their teacher. These treatises are adapted, in the main, to the wants of native students, but the perusal of several of them suggests their possible utility to foreigners also, especially those who are in pursuit of academical honors. There is no need of warning them that certain suggestions should be followed rather cautiously, as, for instance, Dr. R. Pappritz's remark, in 'Anleitung zum Studium der Klassischen Philologie und Geschichte' (Berlin: Fussinger), that private reading and not the hearing of lectures is of prime importance. A whole series of pamphlets, entitled "Wie studiert man, etc.," has been published by Rossberg (Leipzig): Dr. M. Brasch's 'Wie studiert man Philosophie' has been seen through the second edition by Dr. Hans Zimmer, who is also the author of a little guide to the study of pedagogy. Professor Erhard (Freiberg) writes for the benefit of mining engineers, and Professor Birnbaum (Leipzig) for students of the science of agriculture; but the treatises on the study of classical philology, modern philology, medicine, dentistry, and several others, have for their author the versatile "erfahrener Fachgenosse" who, having been "through the mill," can give valuable hints to inexperienced freshmen.

The University Library of Vienna has issued a volume of nearly 800 pages, containing a carefully classified list of all the periodicals taken not only in its own reading-rooms, but in those of all the Austrian high-school and educational libraries. Every periodical published in the Austrian empire is included in the list, and of foreign papers nearly all the scientific publications. Five savants collaborated in this work—Grassauer, Kaukusch, Geyer, Donabaum, and Makasch.

Among the presents given to Grand Duke Karl Alexander of Weimar on his eightieth birthday (June 24) was a publication issued by the Goethe-Schiller Archiv, entitled 'Goethe und Maria Paulowna.' Its object is to supply the material for an appreciation of the relations between Goethe and other literary men of his time and the Grand Duke's mother, who was born in 1786. The monograph contains, among other things, a record of what Goethe, Schiller, and others said and wrote about Maria Paulowna; letters from Goethe; and letters by Maria Paulowna to Goethe and to Schiller's wife.

A few years ago the German Government established at Heligoland a biological station similar to the famous laboratory at Naples, and, while it is on a much smaller scale, it receives the same subsidy—$10,000 a year. Its object is not only to afford students practically free opportunities to study marine life in all its phases, but to promote the welfare of the fishing industry by studying the waters bordering on German soil with German thoroughness. The director of the station is Prof. Heincke, who has several expert assistants, besides four fishermen and five boats at his service. As a practical result of its labors, the institute has already issued two volumes of "Wissenschaftliche Meeresuntersuchungen," with monographs on several kinds of fishes, describing their habits, the places they frequent, etc. Later on, popular editions of these are to be issued for the guidance of fishermen. The Biological Institute is also issuing in instalments Prof. Heincke's exhaustive treatise on the herring, in which a new classification of the varieties of that fish is attempted and the problem of its migrations carefully studied.

A posthumous "List of Portraits in the Various Buildings of Harvard University," instituted by the late Justin Winsor, forms No. 53 of the University Library's Bibliographical Contributions. It is naturally a very miscellaneous collection, since it includes the Peabody Museum among the buildings. Mr. William Garrott Brown, who has carried out Mr. Winsor's design, frankly confesses his deficiency as a connoisseur in portraiture. This is exemplified in the vague "photo. of portrait" of Rousseau, of whom a good iconography exists; and again in the definition of "line engraving" affixed to Kruell's wood engraving of Asa Gray. It is noticeable that this artist, who might almost be styled engraver to Harvard University, is unrepresented (or was, when this list was compiled) by any other of his masterly series of Harvard worthies, the Phillips, Lowell, Holmes, Child, and Norton. His Webster, Lincoln, Grant, and Sherman we will also indicate to those who wish the University to possess the best portraits in black and white of these great Americans.

Mr. Charles F. Lummis tells in the August number of his *Land of Sunshine* (Los Angeles), in language more picturesque and racy than his photographic memoranda, of his recent ascent of the Enchanted Mesa with a considerable party, embracing among others President Jordan of Stanford University, Theodore H. Hittell, the historian of California, and the writer's little girl of six years. The climb, with ropes and ladders, was made in a little more than two hours. Though the soil of the summit has been practically all washed away, traces still remain of human dwellings and occupancy, and the party secured arrow-heads, shell-beads, a turquoise pendant, and chips of agate brought (like the other articles) from a great distance. Incidentally, some account is given of Acoma and the Grand Cañon, which were included in the three weeks' excursion.

—The *Century* for August opens with an illustrated article on "The Arctic Monument Named for Tennyson by Dr. Kane," written by Charles W. Shields, the explorer's brother-in-law. The article contains a couple of letters from Tennyson, and carries the reader back to the romantic period of the search for Sir John Franklin. Those who are interested in heredity will be struck with the account given of the ancestry of Dr. Kane. On his father's side, he was descended from an English officer, who married an aunt of Chancellor Kent. His grandfather married Alida Van Rensselaer; his father was an American judge of note. On his mother's side he was descended from Thomas Leiper, described as "cadet of a Scotch family of French origin," who served by the side of Washington. There united in him, therefore, strains of Scotch, Dutch, French, and English blood, all of which had become in him thoroughly American. Mr. Shields adds that he was also "of Irish origin," but seems to have omitted the evidence on which this statement rests. Those who remember Dr. Kane's charm, gayety, and readiness in conversation will not be likely to be sceptical on this point. The *Century's* group of articles by eye-witnesses of Dewey's exploit at Manila will be found suggestive of much. We will instance the surgeon's confession that he could not endure, on land, the spectacle of human mutilation caused by the American missiles, "as a spectator"—and he was not there to relieve. A valuable paper on "The Sanitary Regeneration of Havana," by Surgeon-General Sternberg, shows that a very large part of the troubles of the pearl of the Antilles have been owing to dirt—and inasmuch as, a hundred years ago, portions of New York and Philadelphia were as filthy as the Jesus María ward of Havana is to-day, there is no reason for despair. In the remarkable series of papers on "Confederate Commerce-Destroyers," James Morris Morgan, formerly midshipman of the Confederate cruiser *Georgia*, gives an account of the "Confederacy's only foreign war," which seems to have been with the Moors. When off the coast of Morocco, Mr. Morgan and a party of officers went ashore, when they were brutally attacked by "a crowd of armed Moors," who literally kicked the whole company into the sea. The ex-midshipman gives a minute account of how he was suddenly seized by the shoulders, twisted round, and unmercifully kicked "at every step" "until I was up to my neck in the sea"; the assailants "desisted only when I climbed into the boat." No one showed fight, but the captain shelled the coast till the Moors, who had no "sea-power," ran away.

—In the *Atlantic* the article on "The Trend of the Century," by Seth Low, and the first instalment of the "Reminiscences of an Astronomer," by Simon Newcomb, are sure to attract attention. We have examined the first with some care to see if Mr. Low's rather comprehensive topic brings him to an avowal of his political creed; but he rather avoids committing himself to any dangerously incisive declaration of faith. He says that "every one is conscious of the new problems, but no one is wise enough to see how they are to be worked out," and, after describing and discussing in turn the panacea of the Anarchist, the Nihilist, the Communist, and the Socialist, reaches the conclusion that "there is nothing to be done but patiently to meet each problem in the best way possible, in the confidence that in the long run the outcome will be advantageous to mankind." This seems to show that Mr. Low is something of an opportunist, and also a good deal of an optimist, which we knew before; but precisely what light this throws on "the trend" of the century we are unable to say. It is certainly a curious illustration of the mental

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

temper of the times that optimism should be the prevailing "note" of the philosophy of the presidents of both Harvard and Columbia. It seems to be as natural an American growth as Indian corn. Prof. Charles Kendall Adams contributes a valuable paper on "Neglected Aspects of the Revolution." Some of the things we have forgotten to remember in this case are that the Revolution was really a civil war, in which there were almost as many good and worthy men on one side as on the other; that the issue of the conflict was so doubtful that it might almost as easily have turned out one way as the other; that the constitutional arguments of the Tories were strong, and that the war was attended by a ferocious proscription which did not reflect much credit on the victorious party. But how was it that men like Washington and Franklin, originally loyalists, were drawn to the support and leadership of the Revolution? It is the desertion of the English side by these men, who were its natural defenders, that is the best proof of the inevitableness of the war. There can be no doubt, however, of the truth of the main point which Prof. Adams wishes to enforce, that until very recently we have received from our teachers a most one-sided view of the whole period.

—*Harper's* contains for its leading illustrated article a most surprising account of "The Convict System in Siberia," by Stephen Bonsal, which differs *toto coelo* from the hitherto accepted account of life in that part of the world. G. W. Smalley contributes "Reminiscences, Anecdotes, and an Estimate" of Mr. Gladstone, collected in the spirit of a candid admirer. He contributes a bit of "private history" with regard to Gladstone's relations with Gordon, to the effect that the former refused to see the latter just before his departure for Egypt, in order to be, later, "in a position to disavow Gordon." At least, the only alternative supposition which Mr. Smalley will admit as possible is that Gladstone's repugnance to meeting Gordon was unconquerable. But Mr. Smalley fails to explain how not seeing Gordon, whose services he had already accepted, and who had had an interview with Lord Granville, would enable Gladstone to "disavow" him. The story that Gladstone, on hearing the news of Gordon's death, immediately went to the theatre to testify his joy at the occurrence, Mr. Smalley explodes by facts showing that he was at the theatre when the news came.

—*Scribner's* is trying experiments in color, for art's sake. The number for August contains a poem, "The Sea is His," by Edward Sandford Martin, embodied or submerged in eight full-page illustrations by Henry McCarter, reproduced in color. We are not sure that the effect of the verse is not somewhat belittled by the process, but then other people might say the same of FitzGerald's 'Omar' as treated by Vedder. "The Landing of the Army," by Richard Harding Davis, like most of Mr. Davis's writing, is vivid, but superficial. "Bumptious" is perhaps the term which a friendly critic might apply. A piece of writing about the war intrinsically more valuable is that of J. F. J. Archibald, who gives an account of the "first engagement of American troops on Cuban soil," an engagement in which the writer was wounded. Of most permanent interest in the number is Capt. Mahan's second paper on "John Paul Jones in the Revolution."

—The July number of the Oxford English Dictionary (New York: Henry Frowde) stretches from *haversine* to *heel*, with a noticeably scanty admixture of Latin or Greek derivatives. *He*, *head*, *heat*, and *heart* are among the longest and most interesting articles. No one has studied his English grammar so well that he cannot learn something from the presentation of the historical development of the pronoun *he* in its various cases. Curious are the survivals of dialectic forms like *ha*, *a*, for the nominative, *hem*, *'em* for the dative-accusative, and *en*, *'n* (*un*) for the accusative, as well as *hisn*, *hern*, and *theirn* for the genitive. Nothing suggests more forcibly the resistance which the unlettered Hodge has offered to literate uniformity of speech. That extension of meaning which by humorous and poetic (metaphorical) comparison charges our simplest words with the greatest diversity of uses, is well exemplified in *head*, in five or six pages of this instalment. We remark here that while a citation for "to keep one's head" is found as early as 1717, Tennyson in 1847 is the earliest authority for "to lose one's head." Either phrase seems, therefore, to be pretty recent. John Bartram (1762) is first caught using the convenient expression "to head" of a river, but this Americanism has gone abroad. *Headstone* (for a grave) is traced back no further than 1775. The literal if not the figurative illustration of "heart of oak" would have gained a serviceable link in Coleridge's latter-day line:

> "If a foe have kenned . . . .
> A rib of dry rot in thy ship's stout side, . . .
> With heart of oak replace it."

And may we query, in passing, under which classification this phrase would fall? *Ship* is clearly figuratively used; but is *heart of oak*, carrying out the metaphor, to be regarded as anything but literal in its application? The Latin origin of "to carry hay in one's horn" would have been deftly shown by Lowell's warning (1846), for the benefit of clergy, respecting Stephen Foster:

> "*Habet* a whole haymow *in cornu*."

And the same poet's allusion (1877) to the fates—

> "They, the unspeakable Three, whose debt,
> Like the hawk's shadow, blots our brightest day"

—would have adorned the short list of figurative uses under *hawk*.

—In the case of *heath*, Dr. Murray is able to fortify conclusively a suspected Shakspere reading, in the "Tempest," "*long* heath"; for Turner, in his 'Names of Herbes' (1548), wrote: "There is in this Countrie two kindes of Heath, one . . . is called long Heath. The other . . . smal Heath." *Heather*, by the way, is not from heath; the two names are topographically at extremes—Scotland and the southern and midland counties of England respectively. Nor is *heathen* certainly 'a dweller on the heath' (as if a loose rendering of Latin *paganus*, villager, rustic, and then non-Christian). The obsolete haw, 'an enclosure,' is cognate with *hedge* and with The Hague ('s Graven hage, 'the Count's Haw'). "To be on the hedge" is interpreted by our American "to sit on the fence." There is no American citation for *hay-fever*, which Southey called *hay-asthma* in 1827, and Sydney Smith by its present name in 1835, and which was first scientifically described, under the name of *summer catarrh*, in 1828, by Bostock. Our rustic *hayseed* is dated back to 1889. We have heard in current (reminiscent) use on this side of the water "as sure as *hearth-money*" (meaning the collection of the tax of that name), a proverb which escaped Dr. Murray's readers. But we must close, with mention only of the discovery that "hear, hear" was originally, in Parliamentary punctuation, "hear him."

FORD'S FEDERALIST.

The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States. By Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. Edited, with notes, illustrative documents, and a copious index, by Paul Leicester Ford. Henry Holt & Co. 1898. 12mo, pp. lxxvii, 793.

A new edition of the 'Federalist,' when there are at least four others on the market, must needs possess some distinctive merits to justify its appearance. That Mr. Ford's work meets this requirement there can be no question. It is emphatically a student's or working edition, and the needs of the student have been paramount in the eyes of the editor. That he has not provided for them with uniform success should not detract from the positive services that he has rendered. First among these must be placed the new index. No one who has had occasion to use the 'Federalist' can have escaped repeated vexation at the very inadequate index which has hitherto been available. Mr. Ford's index is about four times as full as the old one, and, so far as we have tested it, is satisfactory. Other improvements which facilitate consultation are the running titles comprising the topics, the number and author of the essay, and the occasional cross-references to indicate repetitions of the same matter in other papers.

In regard to the text, Mr. Ford has followed Dawson and Lodge in selecting the newspaper text for the first seventy-seven numbers. He has, however, improved upon them by identifying and prefixing to each essay the name and date of the journal in which it first appeared. The same principles of criticism which demand the original text point just as definitely to the choice of the exactly descriptive title of the first collected edition of 1788: 'The Federalist: A Collection of Essays, written in favor of the new Constitution, as agreed upon by the Federal Convention, September 17, 1787.' Instead of this, Mr. Ford, like Lodge, has adopted the title devised by John C. Hamilton: 'The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States.' This title is objectionable for two reasons: it is the invention of an editor, and it is inexact. Almost half of the 'Federalist' is taken up with a general discussion of the defects of the Confederation and of the value of the Union. These earlier numbers are in no sense a commentary on the present Constitution; on the other hand, they may properly be described as essays "in favor of the new Constitution."

Another feature of the editor's treatment of the text must be regarded with grave misgiving, if not positively condemned. He has printed in smaller type that part of the text "which relates to the purely temporary issues of 1788, and much of the historical part, both of which are now of slight value." We question whether this proceeding can be justified either on critical or utilitarian grounds. The 'Federalist' is read to-day, not to understand the Constitution of the United States in 1898, but to understand the history and political thought of the period of its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adoption. Consequently, the editor may render the student a positive disservice by labelling a paragraph "Now of slight value." As an illustration of the political thinking of the time such a paragraph might be the most instructive in the whole essay.

Mr. Ford is the first editor to comment on the text at any length. Dawson planned an elaborate commentary, but never finished it. Mr. Ford's notes are not a systematic critical and historical interpretation of the text, but rather the clever and suggestive running comment of one who combines an extensive knowledge of books with an extensive knowledge of affairs. They will be read for their own quality, but this most exceptional merit is attended by a serious defect, inexactness. The same defect characterizes the introduction. The notes of sound scholarship are precision, verification, and careful authentication of material. Mr. Ford is careless about these essentials. He rarely gives a precise reference to an authority. In the appendix he prints some twenty-five constitutional documents, and in only three cases does he give the source of the collection containing the standard text. These documents are dated only by years, and in not a single instance is there a reference to guide the student to the literature of the subject. It is needless to say that editing a collection of historical documents requires more than simple chronological arrangement. Examples of carelessness are the attribution of De Pauw's 'Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains' to Raynal, p. 71, and the assertion, on p. xl., that "James C. Hamilton edited an elaborate edition of Hamilton's revised text of 1788;" whereas it was John C. Hamilton, and his text, as he expressly tells us, was a combination of those of the editions of 1802 and 1818.

An error of a more serious character is that on p. 274, where, in discussing the slave-trade compromise of the Constitution, Mr. Ford writes: "United with them [*i. e.*, the Carolinas and Georgia] in the desire to maintain the slave trade were Massachusetts and Rhode Island, for in these States a larger part of this profitable traffic centred." It is incorrect to say that Massachusetts and Rhode Island desired to maintain the slave trade. In the first place, Rhode Island, not being represented in the convention, had nothing to do with this compromise. Second, what Massachusetts and Connecticut wanted was the Constitution with a clause authorizing a navigation law, and to get this they sacrificed their preferences in regard to the slave trade. There is no more reason for saying that Massachusetts wanted to maintain the slave trade than for saying that South Carolina wanted a navigation law. In 1785 the Legislature of Massachusetts appointed a committee on the slave trade, and in 1788 passed a law prohibiting citizens of the State, under heavy penalties, from any participation in it. Rhode Island had done the same in 1787. On p. 281 the so-called distribution of the surplus revenue in 1837 is attributed to the Democratic party. It was a Whig measure, and was forced on the Democrats, who accepted it under the guise of a "deposit" of the public money with the States. On p. 269 the Democrats are said to have "originated the first 'protective' legislation." The reference is apparently to the tariff of 1816. Mr. Ford, although a great admirer of Hamilton, evidently does not regard his efforts in behalf of protection as worthy of consideration. It will be remembered that the first tariff bill, 1789, was entitled "An act for the encouragement and protection of manufactures." In the same note, again, the Democrats are made "responsible for the first institution of bounties by the silver-purchase laws." The uninformed reader could hardly be expected to deduce from that utterance the fact that the silver-purchase laws were Republican devices to displace the free coinage of silver, nor the fact that the sugar bounty of 1890 was a Republican measure. It may be remarked, in passing, that although the Republican substitute for free coinage was in effect a bounty, the original Democratic measure was not. Free coinage is properly to be classified as a change in the standard of value.

Other examples might be cited; the foregoing illustrate the point that Mr. Ford's shortcoming is carelessness. He takes the task of writing history much too lightly. The same fault may be found with his style. On p. 142 he writes: "Congress can still act with the greatest celerity (notably in their vote of the funds entailed by the Venezuelan measure)." No President's message can entail either funds or a vote of funds. On p. 268 we read: "The narrow view, here expressed by Madison, he held consistently, while in the opposition, it first found definite expression in Jefferson's 'Opinion on the Constitutionality of the National Bank.'" The implication is that Madison and Jefferson belonged to different parties.

In his introduction Mr. Ford offers a new solution of the question of the authorship of those numbers which have been claimed by and for both authors. His results differ from those of any previous editor, and are in harmony with the claims of neither author. His argument is ingenious, but unconvincing. It invites careful examination and detailed criticism, but we have hardly the space for such a treatment of the subject. Nor is it really necessary at this time. All of this portion of the introduction appeared in the *American Historical Review* for July, 1897, when, as it was ostensibly a reply to Prof. Bourne's article in the April number, it was followed by a rejoinder from Prof. Bourne which revealed some positive errors of fact in Mr. Ford's argument. The opinion was expressed at the time in these columns that Prof. Bourne had successfully maintained his conclusions. That Mr. Ford should then reprint his article in a permanent form, entirely ignoring these criticisms, shows an attachment to preconceived convictions which must militate against his authority as an historical writer.

BISHOP BASS.

The Life and Times of Edward Bass, First Bishop of Massachusetts. By Daniel Dulany Addison. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Mr. Addison has made his book interesting and valuable by setting the life of Bishop Bass in a story of his times. Taken by itself, the Bishop's life would not have been a fruitful theme. Such significance as it had was mainly as illustrating and interpreting the early history of the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts before, during, and after the Revolutionary war. He was born in Dorchester, Mass., November 23, 1726. He graduated at Harvard in 1744, and remained there, pursuing his studies in theology, until 1750. All that we know of these years is that he was twice fined for absence "after the vacancy was up," or, as we should say, after the end of the vacation, and that his thesis for his master's degree was, "Will the blessed in the future world, after the last judgment, make use of articulate speech, and will that be Hebrew?" His biographer often speaks of him as scholarly, and the learned Dr. Bentley of Salem remarks that his library of 46 folios and 240 volumes was the largest outside of Boston, while, strangely enough, it contained no Greek New Testament. When, for some unexplained reason, he turned from the Congregational church of his birthright to the Episcopal, his scholarly attainments did not impress the vestrymen of the Newburyport parish so much as some others. He was found to pare an apple and light a pipe more like a gentleman than any of the other candidates. There being no bishops in the colonies, his ordination involved a journey to London—a risky one, as about one-fourth of all the candidates regularly died there of smallpox. Assuming his charge in 1752, he held it until his death, in 1803, the last six years coinciding with the term of his bishopric.

Newburyport disputes with Marblehead the honor of having the second Episcopal church in Massachusetts, and would seem to have the best of the argument. Almost every parish in New England had its meeting-house quarrel, and Newburyport was no exception to the rule. The bad blood occasioned by such a quarrel was in Newburyport the seed of the Episcopal church. Under Gov. Nicholson's administration, those attached to it were excused from the tithes of the Puritan parish, but this exemption was not long enjoyed. When, in 1715, there was no clergyman, the Puritans fumigated the church with their own preaching, and when a clergyman was secured, the Puritans instituted preaching in a house near by, and their Boanerges roared so loud as to disturb the Episcopalians in their devotions. Judge Sewall's entry in his diary, stating that Mr. Lucas, the Episcopal minister, "cut his own throat," and continuing, "however, the minister of Marblehead set a good face on it, had the Corps carried into the Church, preached a funeral sermon, and buried him therein," is believed by Mr. Addison to have been a slanderous rumor. In due time the Episcopalians had their own meeting-house war, aggravated by the report that the rector had worn "a spreckled handerchief" in the pulpit. Changes in population called for a new church building, and the rector demanded as his right the charge of both the new one and the old one. It was one of the conditions of the settlement of this quarrel in his favor that Mr. Bass was installed as his assistant. He was soon left in sole charge by the death of Mr. Plant.

Mr. Addison's narrative and the documents which he quotes profusely or gives in full, throw much pleasant and instructive light on the religious manners of the time. In the same year with the Lisbon earthquake, Newburyport enjoyed a social one—the introduction of an organ into Mr. Bass's church. It was a famous organ, the first one used in a New England church. It had been given in 1713 to King's Chapel, Boston, after having been refused by the Brattle Street Society. One of the conditions of the bequest was that "a sober person" should be procured "to play skilfully thereon with a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loud noise." As well, thought Cotton Mather, have "Dancing and several other Judaic actions." Mr. Bass's position was that of a missionary of the London Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Many of the missionaries exaggerated the value of their services, but Mr. Bass's modesty was equalled only by his punctuality in drawing his salary every six months. His baptisms of slaves were relatively so numerous as to make it appear that there were many of them in Newburyport. Until 1763 the relations of Mr. Bass and his people with the Congregationalists seem to have been friendly, and after the war there were interchanges of civility which would be impossible at the present time. But in 1763 the virulent Mayhew controversy stirred up the Puritan mind against the Episcopalians, and a little later the Stamp Act and the subsequent measures which heralded the Revolutionary war made bad matters worse. One of the two Episcopal churches in Newburyport having fallen into disuse, the Congregationalists appropriated it, and, Mr. Bass being moved to protest, the local *entente cordiale* was affected seriously. As controversy waxed hotter, Mr. Bass sent to England for books with which to confute 'A Sure Guide to Hell, in Seven Sections,' and other violent assaults on the Episcopal Church and worship.

The natural desire of the Episcopal churches in the colonies to have a bishop of their own was a fruitful source of disputation, and we find Elbridge Gerry writing to Samuel Adams that "it may not be amiss" in certain resolutions "to hit at the church innovations and the establishment of those tyrants in religion—bishops." But there were amenities with all the bitterness, as when, at the burial of Whitefield in 1770, Mr. Bass was one of the pall-bearers. In truth, the Episcopalians owed much to Whitefield. The violence which he excited in the Congregationalist churches was turned to as good practical account by the Episcopalians as was the anti-slavery preaching of a later period.

Mr. Addison has excellent chapters on the churches before the Revolution and the churches during that trying period. Parker of Boston and Bass of Newburyport were the only Massachusetts clergymen of the English church who remained with their parishes. Bass held with the hare and ran with the hounds in a judicious manner. A Tory and "in all respects a good subject," he managed to satisfy the claims of a parish in which there were some ardent patriots, and to live peaceably in a community in which there were many. He did not succeed in satisfying so well the claims of the London Missionary Society. Mr. Weeks, the rector of the church in Marblehead, informed against him as not praying for the King but for Congress, reading the Declaration of Independence in church, taking a collection to clothe American soldiers, and opening his church on Fast Days appointed by Congress. He was convicted on but two of these counts—not praying for the King, and keeping the Fast Days—and his salary as missionary was cut off. This treatment had, possibly, some influence on his views of church government. What is certain is that, when there was much debate over the new constitution of the church, Mr. Bass was for lay representation in its governing body. This attitude distinguished him sharply from the Connecticut churchmen, who were much opposed to lay representation or influence. As to the prayer-book, Mr. Bass would omit the Athanasian Creed and some other things, but not so many as Bishop White of Philadelphia, and he was not sympathetic with White's revolutionary scheme for making a new start with bishops laying no claim to apostolical succession.

He was chosen Bishop of Massachusetts in 1785 by the vote of four Massachusetts and one New Hampshire clergymen, but for some reason he was not consecrated. Mr. Addison does not incline to the view that his election was merely an ecclesiastical device for meeting a certain difficulty. In 1796 he was again elected, seven laymen participating in the election with ten clergymen, and he was consecrated in Philadelphia, after some delay, May 7, 1797. Why Parker of Trinity Church, Boston, a man of much greater force than Bass, did not desire the office, is not clear. It was not an imposing one, and he may have despised the day of small things. Bishop Bass did not; but, on the other hand, he did not magnify his office, never penetrating to those parts of his diocese which lay beyond the Connecticut River. His episcopal duties added little to his parochial cares, and he discharged them with that cautious inoffensiveness which was the most characteristic trait of his behavior at every stage of his ecclesiastical career.

B. F. Stevens's Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives relating to America, 1773-1783. Vol. XXV. Index. London, February 19, 1898.

This is the closing volume of a series which from the beginning has seemed so important that, in these columns, some little space has, from time to time, been allotted to the consideration due it. It is a pleasure to note that, in his list of errata, Mr. Stevens has availed himself of the few suggestions which a careful scrutiny had been able to discover.

At this culmination of a work which has in part occupied thirty years of one man's life, it is proper to look briefly at the undertaking as a whole. Mindful of the Sparks-Mahon controversy as to the obligations of an editor to manuscripts, Mr. Stevens early made up his mind to "servile accuracy," and this he thought was best to be attained by use of photography. To compass the task by this method required no less than 9,000 negatives, besides 3,000 title-pages, descriptions, editorial notes, collations, references, and translations. It became first necessary to establish in England the thesis that the process of photography was, if not implied, at least not denied in a permission to "peruse, catalogue, and copy" the desired records. This point successfully carried, the French Government proved itself willing to follow precedent. No doubt one determining cause of the method chosen was the intimation by Lord Granville, at the time Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in answer to an application by Mr. Stevens to use American papers in the Public Record Office, that he must "take the whole or leave the whole of each individual document, . . . and garble none as had been done by two most eminent historians." This set the pace, and it was kept. Mr. Stevens has thought fit to defend himself for offering facsimiles instead of careful transcripts in print. No one would seriously have differed with him in this matter, but it is well to have his view. The inaccessibility of most manuscripts, the general demand to-day for veracious sources (and documents are the true sources), and the stimulation to work caused by examination of originals, blemished and unsightly as they may chance to be, were inducements enough to present the best possible substitute—photographic facsimiles on enduring paper, beautifully imitating in "fibre, texture, color, sizing, and mill-finish" some models of the Revolutionary period. Accepting Mr. Stevens's explanation as satisfactory in regard to the documents, it may yet be true that it would have been serviceable had he put his translations, which he has admittedly offered only as gratuities, into print, though this plan would necessarily have detracted from the symmetry of the volumes. The lack of a strict chronological arrangement, which has puzzled even those most inclined to admire the work, is explained by the decision to extract at once all documents wanted from each volume as intrusted for inspection. In private collections use was allowed for only a short time, while to have held all facsimiles unprinted until a final order was complete would have involved the keeping, as Mr. Stevens says, "of tons, literally tons, of lithographic stones."

To those who are unfamiliar with the currents of historical study in this country it will be a surprise and a disgust to learn that, in promoting the interests of his Facsimiles and Catalogue-Index, Mr. Stevens encountered the "strong opposition of an eminent historian"—possibly one of those referred to by Granville—on the ground that, the history of the United States having been carefully written, it was needless to give the "rising generation" the chapter and verse of original authorities, because such references might invalidate the supposed accuracy of "quotations and conclusions." Possibly Mr. Stevens has understated the other side, but it makes it tolerably sure that we have among us a Propagation of the Historical Faith of which such men as the late George Bancroft and the present senior Senator of Massachusetts are to be considered diligent servants.

Chief among the more concrete portions of the collections are the following: The papers of the Peace Commission of 1778 (vols. iv., xi., xii., and parts of i. and v.); Deane's relations with the French Government (vi., vii., viii.); Chief Justice Smith's letters to Eden (vii.); Sir Henry Clinton to Eden (vii., x.); Henry Laurens papers (x.); Lord Stormont's correspondence from Paris (xiii. to xvi., xviii. to xxii.); Arthur Lee's Berlin papers, including the "despatch-box" story (xv.); Lafayette's unofficial correspondence (xvii.); Siege of Savannah (xxiii.); Oswald's and Serle's letters from the Earl of Dartmouth manuscripts (xxiv.). Nor do these exhaust the riches. Under such names in the Index as Beaumarchais, Hynson, Landais, Bancroft, and Wentworth, will be found references which illustrate essential history, and compared to which the communications of Stormont, Vergennes, Weymouth, and the clever Florida Blanca are almost as surface material.

Aside from such documents as are concerned with the actual conduct of the war on American soil, the preponderating bulk of these papers hinge directly or indirectly on the question of American privateers, and more especially on prizes brought or intend-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to be brought into French ports. On this point the true diplomacy of the Revolution turned.

It is supererogatory to explain the importance of this collection or to praise the fidelity and elegance of execution. The natural sentiment is one of gratitude that the task should have reached completion without mishap, and, it may be sincerely hoped, not without reward. It is our greatest historical monument since Force's "Archives," and altogether the stateliest in form. In saying this we do not forget Mr. Thwaites's 'Jesuit Relations' and the Putnam editions of the American Fathers. To these other tasks Mr. Stevens's attempt must have proved an inspiration.

An admirable portrait of Mr. Stevens; a preface, from which has been frankly drawn some of the substance of the present notice; a numerical arrangement of all the documents, with added dates; a chronological arrangement of the documents; an alphabetical arrangement of writers, receivers, or indicative words; and finally a subject-matter index, without which the other twenty-four volumes would be "without form and void"—such is the composition of the last volume, and in this nearly perfect achievement the end has crowned the work, and Mr. Stevens's long and patient task is happily done.

The Attitude of the Greek Tragedians towards Art.—Greek Tragedy in the Light of Vase Painting. By John H. Huddilston. The Macmillan Co.

In these two recent works Dr. Huddilston has hit on a rather new vein, which has not been fully explored even by German scholarship. The former monograph has Euripides for its centre, and brings out in a very interesting manner the sympathetic feeling of this poet for the art of his period, and his technical acquaintance with its details. Art was one of the many sides on which he touched the life of his generation and represented its moods and general drift. If he had not actually, according to the tradition, the training of a painter, he was at any rate a connoisseur, with an eye for the picturesque and a splendid gift for pictorial description. He was his own most brilliant scene-painter. He indulged his gift, doubtless, to the delight of his audiences. It was an innovation; it was not dramatic action, but it brought out his strong point, it was justified partly by the tradition of the Messenger's speech, partly by success. The tableaux he painted so minutely linger on the memory, and impressed with their vividness the art of the following centuries.

Sophocles had not the same taste or the same gift; if he had, he preferred not to indulge it. His extant plays contain hardly an allusion to the rich developments of art that were going on about him; they reveal no interest in the subject. This may have arisen simply from a deliberate avoidance of such matters; his dramatic instinct may have regarded them as alien and superfluous. At any rate, his silence or indifference in this direction is remarkable; he stands, in fact, quite alone in this attitude, since Aeschylus is distinctly fond of the spectacular, and shows a strong interest in the art of his period. He describes in detail, for example, the devices borne by the Chieftains in the "Seven against Thebes," and these devices are more or less realized in contemporary art. We note, by the way, in Dr. Huddilston's catalogue of these on page 25, Eteocles for Eteoclos (as he would write it). The silence of Sophocles as to matters of art is so marked that our author proposes a novel and ingenious test of the much disputed authorship of the "Rhesus." The decorations of the armor of Rhesus are quite in the Euripidean style; the Thracian cloak in which he passed the night was first becoming known to the Greeks in the fifth century, and was a fashion that probably disappeared soon after. Such allusions are absolutely foreign to all we know of Sophocles; they would entirely fit a youthful Euripides, still under the influence of Aeschylus. It is well known, since the French excavations, that we have utterly lost the great temple of Apollo at Delphi, its statuary, its pediments, and metopes; yet the chorus in the opening of the "Ion" are so minute in their description of its beauties that Dr. Huddilston attempts a restoration of three metopes from their admiring exclamations.

So much for Euripides, the connoisseur; his influence on art was as enduring as it was extraordinary. It began almost in his lifetime, and it is felt in the Roman sarcophagi and the Pompeian wall-paintings. It inspired the passion and violence of the Farnese Bull, and struck the note of the sculpture of the Pergamene school. So far as the vases are concerned, they are another testimony of his lasting and widespread popularity. His plays were really made household words by wandering troops of actors; they became familiar from Asia Minor to Italy. Out of hundreds of Etruscan urns two-thirds deal with Euripidean scenes. The cheap Megarian bowls are a popular illustration of the mania for Euripides. The artist generally works with independence, and is inspired rather than controlled by the original scene. Occasionally, in some detail, he can be detected following with fidelity the letter of the poet. The vase then becomes a precious, because nearly contemporary, commentary on the text.

Aeschylus is the next favorite with the artists, particularly his famous picture of the Sleeping Furies in the Delphic temple, and his recognition scene at the tomb of Agamemnon. Curiously enough, he is not in vogue with the Attic potters; every one of the scenes here published derives from vases of Lower Italy, and this means that certain of his plays continued to be admired by those ardent theatre-goers of Apulia and Campania, who preferred a good play to fighting or transacting serious business with Roman ambassadors.

Not a single vase-painting can be positively assigned to any extant play of Sophocles. Of course, nine-tenths of his plays are lost, and the monuments are very incomplete. However, the fact is singular, and Dr. Huddilston explains it by saying that "Sophocles was not a creative power." He really means that Sophocles, so far as we know, did not invent many novel and strikingly picturesque scenes which lend themselves to the painter. He did make especially his own the psychological development of character and the presentation of its working; and this power is eminently creative. But you can't paint the workings of the mind of a Philoctetes.

Dr. Huddilston very properly objects to the present entire dissociation of archæology from editions of the tragedians. He forgets, perhaps, Dr. Sandys's learned and beautiful edition of the "Bacchæ," and the delight and illumination which its illustrations afford; in an amateurish way, the recent French translation of the "Lysistrata," with colored engravings by Notor, shows how fascinating may be made the association of the text with the monuments. Dr. Huddilston is himself well equipped for the task which he suggests. His acquaintance with the monuments is wide and scientific, his judgment and reasoning in matters of art are sound, his selections most instructive. He may perhaps give us a specimen of some play or plays in which the illustrations shall include a judicious selection from all the sources—sarcophagi and paintings, as well as the vases. If he does, may we suggest that he prepare himself, and clear his style of German idioms by taking a good bath in "some well of English undefiled"? He has lately read so much German that he has temporarily forgotten how to write his native tongue. "Agave *will* impale" for wishes to impale; "one should not think," "one is led up," as if the English use of *one* coincided entirely with that of the German *mann*; and again, the "affair transpires on the seashore," "equally much," "neither of his compilers concerned themselves." These are a few of scores of slips which we have marked, and which we set down not in malice, but in hopes of neater workmanship from an able and industrious scholar.

Sir Hudson Lowe and Napoleon. By R. C. Seaton. London: David Nutt. 1898.

Of the thirty or forty books relating to Napoleon's second captivity, O'Meara's 'Voice from St. Helena' is quite the most celebrated, and during Sir Hudson Lowe's lifetime it did his character much harm. Napoleon, in his last interview with Lowe, called him a *sbirro Siciliano*, and the idea that the Governor of the island had acted towards the ex-Emperor like a thief-taker or a jailer, stood in the path of his future promotion. After his return to England in the autumn of 1821, the only appointments which came his way were the government of Antigua and the command of the forces in Ceylon—this, too, in spite of the cordial reception given him by the King at the first levee he attended.

O'Meara's attack, unanswered as it remained, had its intended effect, and, ever since, the burden of proof has rested with those who take Lowe's part. He died in comparative poverty, though without having suffered depression of spirits either from the reports spread about him or from the neglect with which successive ministries treated his claims. Nine years later the evidence in his defence was brought together by an able lawyer, William Forsyth, and published in three volumes as the 'History of the Captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena.' If we may liken this work to a full pleading, Mr. Seaton's sketch is a brief in the case. Forsyth's apology is half forgotten because of its length. "Lowe's character is there completely vindicated, it is true, but it is also completely buried." Mr. Seaton aims at making Forsyth's results effective, and especially at destroying whatever influence may have been produced by the last reprint of O'Meara, now called 'Napoleon at St. Helena.'

Considering the state of English feeling towards Napoleon, it was a proof of the highest confidence in Lowe that he should be given charge of the dreaded captive. The *Times* of July 25, 1815, expressed the hope

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the first procedure on the *Bellerophon's* arrival would be "a special commission, or the appointment of a court-martial to try Bonaparte for the murder of Capt. Wright." However far Lord Holland and his supporters might go in censure of the Government for their decree of perpetual exile, the popular sentiment favored harsher treatment still. To keep a single prisoner on an island under the Southern Cross may now seem to have been a simple matter for a Power of England's naval strength; but there was always an off chance of escape, and on the choice of a proper guardian European peace might depend. Lowe was probably selected because, through a long term of service, he had shown himself a vigilant officer. Sir John Moore once said to him: "Lowe, when you're at the outposts I always feel sure of a good night's rest." The salary of £12,000 which went with his position is a gauge of its importance.

There can be no doubt that Napoleon at St. Helena posed as a martyr with a view to securing his release. Like all Frenchmen of that period, he found difficulty in grasping the fact that the English Opposition was a constitutional rather than a revolutionary party. He sought to touch public sympathy by the sight of his woes, to the end, as Las Cases says in one of the suppressed passages of his journal, "that the Opposition in England might not fail to attack the ministry on the violence of their conduct towards us." Lowe had to meet what Count Montholon called, in conversation with Col. Jackson, "la politique de Longwood," namely, complaints, protests, and abuse. Besides these annoyances from the Napoleonic household, he had two other difficulties—the first, his own peculiarity of manner; the second, his instructions from the home authorities. Among the Governor's standing orders were several which proved sources of constant friction; for instance, that the title "Gen. Bonaparte" should always be used, and that an orderly should see him twice a day to reduce the chances of his escape.

The peculiarity of Lowe's manner which we have mentioned can best be described in his son's words. "In speaking, he was frequently embarrassed for words, and in society alternated very much between extreme taciturnity and vehement animation of discourse. Even the greatest excitement, however, scarcely made his diction fluent." A cheerful, thick-skinned person might have suited the place better in some respects, but Lowe's watchfulness was what the Government wanted. So far from appearing brutal to his official superiors, the hint reached him from London that he was over-lenient. He raised the grant for Napoleon's household expenses from £8,000 to £12,000, and if, after the experience of five interviews, he refused to hold any further personal communication with his captive, he often "used his power to mitigate harshness and not to aggravate it." O'Meara's private grudge and foolish inconsistencies are a fair prey for Mr. Seaton, and his *seriatim* answers to the charges which have been brought against Lowe constitute a strong case. We quote his concluding sentence: "It is to the honor of England that the truth of this miserable affair should be known, and the more widely it is known the more will it become recognized that Englishmen have no cause to be ashamed of the conduct of Sir Hudson Lowe at St. Helena." But is not a portion of the load which falls from Lowe's shoulders transferred to those of his superiors?

The Development of the Frog's Egg: An Introduction to Experimental Embryology. By Thomas Hunt Morgan, Ph.D. 8vo, pp. xi, 192; 51 figs. Macmillan.

This work exemplifies the rapid and substantial progress of a branch of cytology which would probably be called "oölogy" but for the prior and general application of that word to the consideration of the comparatively unessential calcareous protecting envelope of certain eggs. The modernity of this "science of the egg" may be inferred from the fact that, of the 223 publications cited, 126 have appeared in or since 1889, when, by the way, the author published the first of his own five contributions. Among the American titles might well have been included Minot's 'Human Embryology,' notwithstanding that its contents for the most part bear only indirectly upon the subject of the present volume. Dr. Morgan has

"attempted to give a continuous account of the development, as far as that is possible, from the time when the egg is forming to the moment when the young tadpole issues from the jelly-membranes. Especial weight has been laid on the results of experimental work, in the belief that the evidence from this source is the most instructive for an interpretation of the development. The evidence from the study of the normal development has, however, not been neglected."

Characteristic chapter-titles are The Formation of the Sex-cells; Polar Bodies and Fertilization; Experiments in Cross-fertilization; Cleavage; The Effect of Injuring one of the first two Blastomeres; Interpretations of the Experiments, and Conclusions. The remarkable—indeed, until recently, well-nigh incredible—experiments of Pflüger, Born, Roux, and others are described, compared, and discussed with impartiality, and the author's own experiments, observations, and conclusions are stated with becoming modesty. Of the fifty-one figures nineteen are original.

An abstract of the contents would be impracticable without the employment of unfamiliar words, some of which are to be found in only the most recent dictionaries. The following passages (from pp. 131 and 136 respectively) may serve to indicate the nature of the facts and problems involved:

"We have seen that one of the first two blastomeres of the frog's egg may develop into a half-embryo, or into a whole embryo of half-size, according to the conditions of the experiment. So long as the first two blastomeres remain in contact without any disturbance of the cell-contents, each blastomere develops its half of the body. On the other hand, if the protoplasm is disturbed by reversing the position of the egg after the first cleavage, there generally results a whole embryo from each blastomere."

"Whitman has stated his conviction that it is erroneous to think of the embryo as only the sum-total of cells interacting upon one another, but that the embryo itself is to be thought of as a whole, which regulates its parts regardless of cell-boundaries. According to this view, each portion of the embryo has its fate sealed, not because the given portion forms a member of the community of cells, but because the whole directs the fate of each special part. Driesch has pointed out that the egg seems to act like an intelligent being. If so, are the causes of differentiation and of regeneration the same in kind as physico-chemical causes, or do they belong to the category of intelligent acts, and can these latter be accounted for by the *known* principles of chemistry and physics? The plain answer is, We do not know."

As a literal "introduction," *i. e.*, as a manual for beginners and for laboratory students, this work might be improved by greater clearness in some passages, and by fuller description of certain figures. Most readers will be rather annoyed than aided by the occurrence of italicized words and phrases upon nearly every page, particularly when, as on pp. 61-62, there is an apparent lack of discrimination. The general employment of technical terms like *heterotypic*, *homœotypic*, and *metakinetic* permits considerable condensation; but whether this commendable feature was definitely aimed at might well be questioned in view of the verbal superfluity presented by p. 11: the word *spermatozoon* is, of course, required in the first line of the page and at the beginning of the explanation of the figure, but its seven repetitions might have been omitted without risk of misapprehension. Even if we concede the possibility of a deliberate choice of *pneumogastric* over *vagus*, and of *medullary* over *neural*, we fail to find excuse for the indiscriminate employment of the alternative words, as, *e. g.*, on pp. 148 and 159-164. Only two typographic errors have we noted, both in the index, viz., *retma* for retina, and *Cuvierians* for Cuvierian. The index is unpardonably incomplete. Surely, too, the references in the index should include the pages where words are first mentioned, and especially where they are defined; yet *polyspermy*, which occurs on pp. 24 and 29, is referred only to p. 30, and *yolk-plug* only to p. 140, although defined on p. 53.

Yet the above-enumerated shortcomings as to method and terminology might almost be condoned in view of the conspicuous absence of *Anlage*. Any occasion for its original importation has ceased since the revival of Aristotle's *proton*, an international word readily understood by all educated persons and naturally pronounced in but one way. Dr. Morgan is evidently free from the apparent tendency of some American biologists to endow the outlandish German vernacle with a significance akin to that of the foreign labels upon their trunks.

Applied Mechanics. By John Perry. Van Nostrand. 1898. Pp. 678.

Prof. Perry is a well-known English physicist and engineer. We reviewed, some time ago, his somewhat eccentric 'Calculus for Engineers,' a notable book in its way. The present text-book resembles that in mixing up together heterogeneous considerations linked only by the facts to which they are commonly applied, and in utterly disregarding the logical development of the science. But, unlike that, this book is, from a pedagogical point of view, unquestionably an important publication, destined to wide employment even in this country, to which it is not particularly adapted. A skilful teacher will certainly be able to make it serviceable in imparting to the ordinary student of engineering as much of that branch of his art of which it treats as that student is likely to need. Its unsystematic arrangement, far from being keenly felt, will recommend it to teacher and pupil. It will only be after the student has studied it for two years, and has put it upon his shelves as a work of reference whose value as such is enhanced by his intimate acquaintance with it, that the inconveniences of it will begin to vex him. A right method in teaching will undoubtedly bring theory and its application into the closest possible juxtaposition; but it would be better that the professor's lectures should zigzag through a logically ordered treatise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that the text-book itself should be fragmentary and deranged.

Prof. Perry's attitude toward mathematical analysis may be characterized as one of reaction and resentment against needless complications. It is surprising, therefore, to find the author devoting so much as twenty pages to the mathematical theory of elasticity. Really to understand that theory, the student would have to double the time he devotes to mechanics in his preparation for the exercise of his profession; and, after all, he would not be able to build any ordinary structure at all the better for this extra study. Indeed, from the engineer's point of view, this theory is a typical example of just the sort of mathematical analysis that he ought to seek to avoid. From certain other points of view—as, for example, in reference to the constitution of matter—the theory is simply invaluable. But, for the engineer, mathematics, as Prof. Perry well observes, can serve only as a guide. The conditions of its problems are merely hypothetical; so that its solutions must, in any case, be tested experimentally. The theory of elasticity, applied to the ordinary problems of the engineer, only leads, by a devious and difficult path, to results far from demonstrative and of no great moment. As long as there are mathematicians who, for their own purposes, choose to work such problems out, the engineer may as well examine their conclusions to see what they can teach him; but he will not find in them any suggestions (and mathematics supplies to him nothing but suggestions) which he might not have reached more economically than through a deep study of the theory of elasticity. Prof. Perry remarks (p. 586): "There seems to be as much absence of common sense now in academic persons as there was in the time of Erasmus." This, if not polite, is a refreshingly frank expression of the engineer's side of the case. It comes to this, that "academic persons" are apt to look at physical phenomena from the point of view of pure science, very much to the ultimate advantage of civilization; while the engineer is compelled to look at them in their relation to a narrow class of practical applications.

Comparing this treatise with the classical work bearing the same title, by Rankine, who was at once an "academic person" and a great engineer, we are struck with the measureless inferiority of the later work from an intellectual point of view. But the blame does not rest on the shoulders of this particular writer. The historic season has changed since Rankine wrote, in 1858; we see it on every hand. The truth is that an age of intellect is a blossoming in its nature almost ephemeral. Nearly four hundred years have now fled since the 'De Revolutionibus' was printed, and we are being hurried into a century when feeble minds will be able to do all that will be wanted of intellectual labor. The bloom of pure intellect could not last longer. Henceforth must come a season of the ripening of the fruit. Such, at least, seems to be the prognostication that the aspects justify for the exact sciences.

An inevitable consequence of its effort to render all rough places smooth, is that this book passes unnoticed the most difficult problems in the mechanics of engineering—those which arise in reference to great suspension-bridges, ship-building, and aerial navigation. It may be feared that, however successful the method of instruction it embodies may be in turning out good ordinary engineers, it may prove less favorable towards the continuance of the body of men who make great advances in their art. A relaxation in the tension of pure intellect, of which this publication is one of a hundred symptoms, can hardly fail to be speedily followed by a falling off even in those very practical applications which are beginning to be popularly regarded as the synonym of science.

Choses et Gens d'Amérique. Par Th. Bentzon. Paris: Calmann Lévy; New York: Dyrsen & Pfeiffer. 1898.

Madame Blanc in this volume has added something to the obligations already due her from American writers, and again may claim from them the tribute "Bene meruit de re publica nostra." Mme. Blanc has for a good while held her graceful pen and her position as an esteemed contributor to the *Revue des Deux Mondes* largely in the service of American literature, by critical articles so kind in tone that at times they seem to savor of the "geniality" of an earlier day; while by her excellent translations she has brought to the knowledge of French readers many of our younger and more modern writers of prose and verse. Her visits to America, too, have been well-timed and happy. We found our guest charming, and she found in us something to respect as well as to like. Her present volume is a collection of clever and interesting magazine articles bearing for the most part upon social topics. The first of these contains some account of the late Mr. Edward Bellamy's theories as set forth in his 'Equality' and in his other writings. Of these the author takes what we suppose may be called the sensible view, holding them to be somewhat light and inconclusive. In sharp contrast with this is the next chapter, which relates minutely and in a very entertaining way the story of a visit to the Shaker colony at Alfred, Me. Many points of resemblance between the life of the Shakers and that of Catholic religious communities are more obvious to Mme. Blanc than they perhaps might be to an ordinary Protestant observer. She finds the underlying ascetic spirit, the idea of vocation, religious detachment from the world and devotion to the community, to be essentially the same in each. The differences seem to be for the most part merely ceremonial and theological. This chapter is delightful reading. So, too, is the next, even if one hesitates a little at the qualification, "An American Loti," as applied to Mr. Charles Warren Stoddard. But Mme. Blanc is very sympathetic, and seems to take as sincere a delight in Mr. Stoddard's descriptions as he himself takes in the things he describes. Besides, she is careful to point out that the savor which some find unpleasant in Loti's work is entirely absent from Mr. Stoddard's pages. Another article, "Un Musicien Poète," written with equal kindness but with perhaps less sound judgment, sings the praises and predicts the future glories of the late Mr. Sidney Lanier. The last two chapters are concerned with life in the Southwest as seen in the stories of Octave Thanet, and with family life in America. This last is an article which appeared first in English in the *Forum* for March, 1896, and which may be taken as being already known to readers.

Mme. Blanc has, in fine, given us a very clever and agreeable book, and one which may be commended with confidence to the summer reader. A few slips, mostly of slight importance, some probably misprints, were doubtless inevitable and are easily pardoned.

The American Metropolis. By Frank Moss. In three volumes. P. F. Collier.

A profusely illustrated book about New York in three volumes is likely to attract a good deal of attention. Such a publication is that, named above, by the late President of the Board of Police. It is hardly pure history or pure literature (the author calls it an "historigraph"), but is rather to be described as a farrago of information about the city, some of it drawn from histories, some from contemporary sources, and some from the author's own extensive experience. Of style there is much less than none. The first illustration is naturally a portrait of the author, the second that of Dr. Parkhurst, who writes the introduction, and assures us that the book is "the outcome of a revival of the civic spirit, as that revival has come to its experience and expression in the thoughts and activities of one particular man." The meaning of this rather dark saying is that the improvement of the city depends on our "loving it more," and "before we can love it more we need to know it more." Mr. Moss, therefore, full of civic spirit, takes us by the hand, and teaches us to know New York that we may love New York. Echoing this, the author, in his preface, says that "we are in the midst of a revival of civic pride," but these words were evidently written before the recent change in the government, and so, probably, were Dr. Parkhurst's remarks. It would be wrong to allow the reader to suppose that either of them meant that the more we knew of Tammanyized New York, the better we should love it.

We may go further and say that we doubt very much how far the increased knowledge disseminated in these pages is calculated to inspire love. The historical past of New York is not very thrilling, and the author's account of the city as it is is more calculated to produce perplexity than affection. We have found most encouragement to our civic pride in reading some of the pages devoted to the changes which have taken place in the metropolitan world as it appears to the police. Mr. Moss recalls the fact that, within the memory of those now on the stage, New York was an "awfully dangerous place." Thirty or forty years ago, he says, crime stalked through the streets, and well-known criminals plied their trade free from interference unless they were actually caught in the act. "Highway robberies were committed in daylight in the middle of Broadway, which was a regular promenade for gamblers, swindlers, and thieves." Certainly the last state of Broadway is better than this. As for the Bowery, an old thief said to the author recently: "The Bowery is stale, the town is dead. I could stand on the Bowery for hours and not see two of my friends. . . . They are not doing anything in town." The account given of "Chinatown" is also noticeable.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bayles, G. J. Civil Church Law. New York: James Pott & Co.
Brush, Dr. E. F. Human and Bovine Tuberculosis. Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford Co.
Coutts, F. B. M. The Revelation of St. Love the Divine. John Lane. $1.25.
Davey, Richard. Cuba, Past and Present. Scribners. $3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED